



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2015

No. 21

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, be with us not only in great moments of experience but also during life's mundane tasks.

Through the power of Your Spirit, may our Senators mount up with wings like eagles, running without weariness and walking without fainting. Lord, give them the wisdom to be patient with others, ever lenient to their faults and ever prompt to appreciate their virtues. Rule in their hearts, keeping them from sin and sustaining their loved ones in all of their tomorrows. Surround them with the shield of Your favor, as You provide them with a future and a hope, accomplishing in their lives more than they can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 240.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 5, H.R. 240, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 405

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 405) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the American people can get their news in various fashions, whether it is a blog, the nightly news or in a newspaper. They are very concerned. They are concerned about the threat of global terrorism. And why shouldn't they be? Look at what they see.

We see ISIS has murdered tens of thousands of people. One need only to look back at those thousands of Yazidi people who are trapped in the mountains in Iraq. We saw it play on day after day. These people were fleeing for their lives and many of them didn't make it.

We have watched not only tens of thousands murdered, but we have watched them behead people. Just a few days ago we watched them put a man in a cage, set the cage on fire, and burn him alive. They are so void of any

respectability; they are so uncivilized. They filmed 22 minutes of that man suffering the utmost torture until he died—22 minutes of torture.

We look around the world, and in Paris 20 people are dead of a terrorist attack. People are dead in Belgium thwarting that terrorist attack. In Ottawa, Canada, at the Parliament terrorists attacked. In Sydney, Australia, there was an attack in a restaurant.

It seems that no matter what the day is, there is another act of terror that we have to be aware of. We have watched, with some dismay, at the terror that is coming. ISIS has bragged that they are coming our way.

We have our national security agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security, which has protected us from attacks to this point. Now we are 18 days away from having no money for the Department of Homeland Security—18 days. But that is a false number because we are out of session for about 10 of those 18 days. So really, after this week, we are down to less than 1 week to protect our homeland.

Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of Homeland Security, was on national TV yesterday warning the American people of what we face. He went through what his agency does, what they do to protect our homeland. That agency was established during the Presidency of George W. Bush. It happened after 9/11. We consolidated 22 different agencies into something that is more workable. Jeh Johnson has done a very, very good job.

There is border protection, the Coast Guard, and they have responsibilities for preventing cyber attacks. There is rarely a day that goes by when there isn't some cyber attack. Which one is big that day? We had Sony play out, and we had Anthem just a few days ago.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S843

Republicans are hellbent on playing chicken with our national security.

Jeh Johnson said yesterday he would have to furlough as many as 30,000 people if the Republicans decided to do a continuing resolution, which would be at last year's numbers. It would prevent the Department of Homeland Security from funding any new grants. These are grants that help our country, grants for dogs sniffing out all kinds of bad things. These grants fund counter-terrorism task force units. A very big one is waiting to be established in Arizona.

In Las Vegas we have an urban area security initiative. We have 50 million people who come to Las Vegas each year. We need help to make sure local agencies can respond where they have to.

Why are we concerned about these grants? We are concerned because it is what helps local government be ready for these attacks when and if they come.

But the Republicans have come to the conclusion that they are far more afraid of these people—some of whom were here last week—the DREAMers. They dreamed of having a country they could relate to. They came to America as babies. It was the only country they even knew. It was a country where they saluted the flag for many years, and President Obama gave them respectability.

A woman who was here and I talked about last week is a young woman from Las Vegas. Her name is Blanca Gamez. She is a wonderful, wonderful woman. She has two degrees, and she is going to law school next year. She works, and she pays taxes. But it appears that the Republicans are more afraid of her than they are of ISIS—these people who behead people and they burn people in cages.

We cannot allow this to go on the way it is headed. These grants help local firefighters. The DHS directives target criminals instead of families. Republicans, I guess, want us to target these families rather than criminals.

Why are Republicans putting our country at risk?

This isn't some liberal cabal that is talking about this. Let's take, for example, one of the most conservative publications in America, the Wall Street Journal. They wrote a featured opinion piece today about Republican Members of Congress.

The Wall Street Journal says the Republicans' reckless strategy is doomed to fail. Even the very conservative editors of that newspaper said today that Republicans' reckless scheme is destined for—what is in their words—“a spectacular crack-up.” These are a few things of what they say in the article.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the February 9, 2015, opinion article from the Wall Street Journal entitled: “Can the GOP Change?”

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal Editorial, Feb. 8, 2015]

CAN THE GOP CHANGE?

The immigration defeat reveals a larger problem in Congress.

Republicans in Congress are off to a less than flying start after a month in power, dividing their own conference more than Democrats. Take the response to President Obama's immigration order, which seems headed for failure if not a more spectacular crack-up.

That decree last November awarded work permits and de facto legal status to millions of undocumented aliens and dismayed members of both parties, whatever their immigration views. A Congressional resolution to vindicate the rule of law and the Constitution's limits on executive power was defensible, and even necessary, but this message has long ago been lost in translation.

The Republican leadership funded the rest of the government in December's budget deal but isolated the Department of Homeland Security that enforces immigration law. DHS funding runs out this month, and the GOP has now marched itself into another box canyon.

The specific White House abuse was claiming prosecutorial discretion to exempt whole classes of aliens from deportation, dumping the historical norm of case-by-case scrutiny. A GOP sniper shot at this legal overreach would have forced Democrats to go on record, picked up a few supporters, and perhaps even imposed some accountability on Mr. Obama.

But that wasn't enough for immigration restrictionists, who wanted a larger brawl, and they browbeat GOP leaders into adding needless policy amendments. The House reached back to rescind Mr. Obama's enforcement memos from 2011 that instructed Homeland Security to prioritize deportations of illegals with criminal backgrounds. That is legitimate prosecutorial discretion, and in opposing it Republicans are undermining their crime-fighting credentials.

The House even adopted a provision to roll back Mr. Obama's 2012 order deferring deportation for young adults brought to the U.S. illegally as children by their parents—the so-called dreamers. The GOP lost 26 of its own Members on that one, passing it with only 218 votes.

The overall \$40 billion DHS spending bill passed with these riders, 236-191, but with 10 Republicans joining all but two Democrats in opposition. This lack of GOP unity reduced the chances that Senate Democrats would feel any political pressure to go along.

And, lo, on Thursday the House bill failed for the third time to gain the 60 votes needed to overcome the third Democratic filibuster in three days. Swing-state Democrats like Indiana's Joe Donnelly and North Dakota's Heidi Heitkamp aren't worried because they have more than enough material to portray Republicans as the immigration extremists.

Whatever their view of Mr. Obama's order, why would Democrats vote to deport people who were brought here as kids through no fault of their own? Mr. Obama issued a veto threat to legislation that will never get to his desk, and he must be delighted that Republicans are fighting with each other rather than with him.

Restrictionists like Sens. Ted Cruz and Jeff Sessions are offering their familiar advice to fight harder and hold firm against “executive amnesty,” but as usual their strategy for victory is nowhere to be found. So Republicans are now heading toward the same cul de sac that they did on the ObamaCare government shutdown.

If Homeland Security funding lapses on Feb. 27, the agency will be pushed into a par-

tial shutdown even as the terrorist threat is at the forefront of public attention with the Charlie Hebdo and Islamic State murders. Imagine if the Transportation Security Administration, a unit of DHS, fails to intercept an Islamic State agent en route to Detroit.

So Republicans are facing what is likely to be another embarrassing political retreat and more intra-party recriminations. The GOP's restrictionist wing will blame the leadership for a failure they share responsibility for, and the rest of America will wonder anew about the gang that couldn't shoot straight.

The restrictionist caucus can protest all it wants, but it can't change 54 Senate votes into 60 without persuading some Democrats. It's time to find another strategy. Our advice on immigration is to promote discrete bills that solve specific problems such as green cards for math-science-tech graduates, more H-1B visas, a guest-worker program for agriculture, targeted enforcement and legal status for the dreamers. Democrats would be hard-pressed to oppose them and it would put the onus back on Mr. Obama. But if that's too much for the GOP, then move on from immigration to something else.

It's not too soon to say that the fate of the GOP majority is on the line. Precious weeks are wasting, and the combination of weak House leadership and a rump minority unwilling to compromise is playing into Democratic hands. This is no way to run a Congressional majority, and the only winners of GOP dysfunction will be Mr. Obama, Nancy Pelosi and Hillary Clinton.

Mr. REID. I will read parts of the article:

If Homeland Security funding lapses on Feb. 27, the agency will be pushed into a partial shutdown even as the terrorist threat is at the forefront of public attention with the Charlie Hebdo and Islamic State murders. Imagine if the Transportation Security Administration, a unit of DHS, fails to intercept an Islamic State agent en route to Detroit.

So Republicans are facing what is likely to be another embarrassing political retreat and more intra-party recriminations. The GOP's restrictionist wing will blame the leadership for a failure they share responsibility for, and the rest of America will wonder anew about the gang that couldn't shoot straight.

This is about as serious as anything could be. We need to fund this agency which is so vitally important to our country. We need to pass a clean bill—the bipartisan bill that Speaker BOEHNER and the majority leader agreed to in November—and give the American people the protection they deserve. Anything less is not good, is a disaster for our country, and really is very, very bad to protect our homeland.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with the time equally divided until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, last Wednesday, President Obama made a statement that is troubling to me. I think those of us who believe in Executive leadership and honest leadership, where leaders talk directly to the people about the serious problems we face, have to be troubled by this trend with this administration. Sometimes it makes me fear for the future of the Republic. He accused Republicans of “defunding the very operations that are involved in making sure we’ve got strong border security.” He said Republicans are blocking funding of that. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The House of Representatives—the Republican House—has passed a bill with \$40 billion, funding fully, as basically the President requested, all the agencies in the Department of Homeland Security. It has one little catch to it; it bars the President from taking money from the Department of Homeland Security that is supposed to be used to enforce the law and using that to grant amnesty and to undermine the law. The House bill is not in any way undermining the security of the United States of America, the ability for Homeland Security to protect us from terrorists. In fact, it strengthens that ability because it keeps the money there and uses it for those purposes, whereas right now the President is spending over \$100 million to create a structure across the river that would hire 1,000 new people in Homeland Security to process amnesty applications for people who violated the law and to give them the right to have earned income tax credit benefits, a Social Security card, the ability to take any job in the American economy that maybe an unemployed American would like to have or a recent immigrant with a green card would like to have. No, this person who entered the country now unlawfully gets to take that job under this policy. Congress did not fund that. But it funded the laws of the agency. The President, as he said himself 20 times, had no power to do this.

So what is happening now in the Senate, colleagues? Our Democratic colleagues now unanimously, it appears, are blocking even moving to the bill that funds Homeland Security. So I ask, with all sincerity, how can it be said that the Republicans are failing to fund the operations making sure we have strong border security? How can that be made a statement by the President of the United States?

I think we need to keep talking about that. We should not allow these modern-age politicians to go to the American people with false stories about what is happening. The Democratic Members of this Senate are systematically blocking the bill we would like to see come to the floor that fully funds Homeland Security. They have been given the right, as Senator McConnell has repeatedly stated—which Senator Reid never did—they have been given the right to offer any amendments they would like that are relevant and germane to the bill. So I would say this is a most serious thing with me, and I believe the American people need to understand it.

The House bill will not deny a single penny of funding for legitimate lawful operations of Homeland Security. It will be spent on enforcing the law, enforcing the Immigration and Nationality Act that was actually passed by Congress.

What the President is attempting to do is to create and execute a law Congress rejected. He asked the House to pass this law and the House said, no, they did not agree with this policy and rejected it. So he is executing it anyway.

Senate Republicans have attempted to move the bill to the floor three times, and each time it has been blocked by our Democratic colleagues because the bill does not fund the President’s unlawful Executive amnesty that he admitted 20 separate times he did not have the power to do.

Congress, colleagues, is supposed to spend the taxpayers’ money wisely. Congress should not fund any program, no matter how much the President wants it, that they believe is bad policy. More importantly, more clearly, no Senator should vote to fund a Presidential policy that violates the law, that violates the Constitution, that distorts the relationship between the Congress, which makes laws, and the President, who is supposed to execute only the laws Congress makes. So that is where we are at this point.

The President is not entitled to spend taxpayer money to implement a system of immigration that Congress has rejected. An article in yesterday’s Washington Times is further indication of where we are in this world of politics. It was reported that the Department of Homeland Security is spending taxpayer money to set up hotlines for illegal immigrants to call in to with any complaints they may have about immigration law enforcement officers if they think the officers have violated their “rights” under President Obama’s Executive amnesty—not violating their rights under law—but the President has told them this and sent out this message to the stakeholder groups.

Now who are the stakeholder groups? I suppose they are the activist groups. That is how they refer to them: stakeholders. So they send out this message: If you are not happy with the way the

Federal agency is executing my policy but indeed those agencies are attempting to enforce the law as written, then you have a “right” to call in to this hotline, and I will get on them, and I will see that they do it.

So how do the officers feel about this? National Border Patrol Council vice president Shawn Moran said this in a response. First, let me tell you, the Border Patrol officers in the USCIS—the Citizenship and Immigration Services officers—have opposed the President’s Executive amnesty. Their association has laid out how it will make the problem worse, it will increase the risk of terrorist attacks, and otherwise further degrade the integrity of our legal system. They have been clear about this. We ought to listen to them. They enforce that law repeatedly. That is their duty. They have opposed bills that they think may look good on the surface but once they have read them and found out the bill will not work effectively, they speak out against that, which is very helpful, and I am glad they do.

Well, this is what Mr. Moran said:

Instead of supporting our agents, this administration had decided it is more important to find new ways to solicit complaints and invite ridicule against them.

The American people have to know that the Obama administration’s dereliction of duty relating to our immigration system did not begin with this recent decree. From the day he took office, the President has relentlessly and systematically, colleagues, friends, the American people, dismantled immigration enforcement. It is far more serious than you would imagine.

My office has compiled a 49-page baseline timeline of nearly 200 specific entries and events that occurred since 2009 detailing how the law of the United States has been undermined by directives and orders from the President of the United States. It is step by step. This one person alone, the President, has acted against the will of the American people and undermined the law in America.

Just briefly, I will mention the first event that came to my mind. When he took office in early 2009, I believe in the State of Washington, the officers, doing their duty, enforcing the law that says a business cannot hire somebody unlawfully in America, investigated a business in Washington, discovered quite a number of people unlawfully in America, and were to commence action against the business for violating plain law that is still on the books and has not been repealed. And what happened? Immediately, the President intervened. He told them: No. Do not do this. And he told the activist groups—the La Razas and the other activist groups that were engaged in pushing him on this issue—essentially, he told them: Look, I am going to honor the promise I made to you during the campaign—that is the way I would interpret it—not to allow this kind of lawful activity to happen in the future.

So from day one, the law officers of our country got a clear message. What was the message? If you go out and enforce the law, you will get in trouble. If you do not say anything and do not do anything and stay back and lay back and not enforce the law, everything will be OK. That began the situation.

Here are just some of the highlights that I circled and looked at.

This was the Bellingham, WA, case I just mentioned, detaining 28 illegal immigrants who were using false, fake Social Security documents.

On January 29, 2009, in April of 2009, and June of 2009, the Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano delays the E-Verify deadlines. E-Verify is a system by which businesses are supposed to check a person's Social Security Number to find out if it is valid before they hire them. Many times we know people have used false Social Security Numbers to get work. She delayed that. Then she delayed it again in April, and delayed it again in June.

In June of 2010, the ICE union—the Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers—they are three basic groups: the ICE group, there is the Border Patrol group, and the Citizenship and Immigration Services group that processes the paperwork. The ICE union cast a unanimous vote of “no confidence” in the agency Homeland Security leadership, including ICE Director John Morton and Assistant Director Phyllis Coven, citing “the growing dissatisfaction and concern among ICE employees” that they “have abandoned the Agency’s”—ICE’s—“core mission of enforcing United States Immigration Laws and providing for public safety, and have instead directed their attention to campaigning for programs and policies related to amnesty.”

He said the policy of this government—not what we as sworn officers are supposed to be enforcing, but the policy of our leaders is to spend all their time campaigning for policies related to amnesty and undermining enforcement.

ICE officers went so far, colleagues, as to file a lawsuit in Federal court contending they were being ordered to violate the law by their supervisors. A judge expressed sympathy for them but eventually decided they didn't have standing to proceed with the case, but I think it is still on appeal.

In 2011, at a roundtable with amnesty advocates, President Obama admitted his deportation statistics were misleading. Indeed, they have been. They claim they have increased deportation, but that is totally incorrect. They finally had to admit it.

In February of 2012 President Obama slashed the budget for the 287(g) Program, a program that I helped advocate for and moved forward when I came to the Senate 10 years ago. It simply says the Federal Government will work with State and local law enforcement officers to train them in the things they can legally do to help the Federal officers enforce the law. It is a per-

fectly sensible program, and it is very popular. A number of States have taken quite a step toward it. It was working in an effective way, and they canceled it after he took office.

They announced the delay in the biometric entry-exit visa system in February of last year. An inspector general audit revealed declines in workplace enforcement of substantial amounts as a direct result of White House policies, and they admit the Obama administration manipulated deportation data.

In March of last year a new report revealed that the ICE officers—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair, and I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to wrap up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. It was revealed that ICE released 68,000 convicted criminals in 2013. These are convicted criminals.

In May of last year the Deputy Chief of Border Patrol revealed that the border surge was incentivized by the administration's policies.

As I said, there are 49 pages of this.

I would point out that we are ready to bring the bill to the floor and allow amendments to the legislation passed by the House that fully funds Homeland Security and ensures that the money is spent for enforcement and not to dismantle the law.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

BOTTICELLI NOMINATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, Senator ALEXANDER and Senator ENZI are here on the floor. I want to briefly address the nominee we will be voting on this afternoon and then turn to the matter the three of us wish to address.

Today the Senate is going to vote on the nomination of Michael Botticelli to be the next Director of National Drug Control Policy. I look forward to working with our Nation's next drug czar just as I have with previous drug czars.

Drug abuse is a serious problem in my home State. Kentucky is the fifth highest prescribing State when it comes to pain killers, and we have the Nation's third highest drug overdose mortality rate, with many deaths driven by prescription pain killers.

Heroin abuse is also a problem in the Bluegrass State. Heroin deaths accounted for 32 percent of the drug overdoses back in 2013, and they continue to climb. The epicenter of the heroin problem is located in the northern region across the river from Cincinnati, although I am hearing more and more from constituents that drug abuse is rising in other parts of the Commonwealth as well.

All told, the Kentucky Office of Drug Control Policy reports that about 1,000 Kentuckians lose their lives overdosing on drugs every year, which is more than we lose in fatal car crashes.

There is another reason I am pleased to welcome prior drug czar Gil Kerlikowski to tour Kentucky. We had him there a couple of years ago to take a closeup look at the problems we face. He visited Louisville, Lexington, London, and Pikeville—four communities, both urban and rural, across the State. He met with Kentuckians who worked to tackle this issue from every single angle—public health officials, medical professionals, law enforcement officials, drug courts, members of the business community, and Kentuckians involved with prevention. The drug czar's visit helped focus more Federal attention and Federal resources on this issue, and in a time of strained budgets, the extra attention and those extra resources are particularly important.

I am also pleased to report that Mr. Botticelli plans to visit Eastern Kentucky soon. He also plans, at my invitation, to visit Northern Kentucky this spring. Visits such as these help ensure continued Federal focus on Kentucky's drug problem, and I look forward to working with the next drug czar to move closer to the day when drug abuse is no longer ravaging our families and our communities.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ENZI pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 8 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

BOTTICELLI NOMINATION

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of Michael Botticelli in our effort today to confirm him as Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The State of Massachusetts, like too many other regions of this Nation, is being ravaged by the scourge of prescription drug and heroin addiction that is breaking apart families and burying communities under a mountain of despair. Massachusetts experienced 114 deaths in December, and that doesn't count our biggest cities, such as Boston and Worcester and Springfield.

Drug overdose deaths fueled by prescription pain killers now claim more lives than car accidents nationwide. Approximately 100 Americans die from an overdose every day.

As a Senator from Massachusetts, I have a deep appreciation and respect for Michael Botticelli's accomplishments addressing addiction during his nearly two decades serving in the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. He is a public health and drug policy pioneer, and he lived in my hometown of Malden, MA, while he did this job.

Immediately prior to joining the Office of National Drug Control Policy as Deputy Director, Mr. Botticelli was the director of the Bureau of Substance Abuse Services at the Massachusetts

Department of Public Health. While he was there, he pioneered innovative, effective approaches to substance abuse challenges. He was responsible for launching a program that expanded treatment and recovery opportunities in local community health centers, including a focus on providing a continuum of care for those suffering with substance use disorders. Mr. Botticelli also expanded innovative and nationally recognized prevention strategies. He established and implemented evidence-based jail diversion programs, reentry services for those leaving State and county correctional facilities, and overdose prevention programs.

Although there is always more work to be done, it is because of Mr. Botticelli's efforts and the legacy he left behind that Massachusetts is in many ways a national leader in addressing the prescription and heroin abuse epidemic.

Mr. Botticelli has been very public about his personal history of struggling with an alcohol use disorder as a young professional and seeking help that has led him into long-term recovery. He recently celebrated 26 years of sobriety, and I applaud him for that.

Mr. Botticelli's personal life experiences have provided him a unique perspective on the epidemic facing our Nation. When he joined me at a recent roundtable I convened in Boston about this crisis, he spoke about it in human terms. He reminded us that there is a family, a loved one, a friend, or a child behind each and every one of these statistics. His openness about his own struggles and his path to recovery helped shed much needed light on the issue of addiction, which has lurked too long in the shadows of shame and stigma. I think his story helps others to seek treatment and begin a life of recovery. He truly is leading by his own personal example.

The drug problems facing our country have changed dramatically since the Office of National Drug Control Policy was created in 1988. Mr. Botticelli has an excellent understanding of the mission of this office, the changing needs of the addiction community, and the urgency for solutions to halting the rise of substance use disorders in this country. I believe he is going to make a superlative Director, bringing his strong heart, keen mind, and Malden, MA, roots to the Office of National Drug Control Policy. I am honored to speak in support of his nomination on the floor today and look forward to working with him in the years to come. I recommend in the strongest possible terms Michael Botticelli for the Office of Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UKRAINE ASSISTANCE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I wish to speak about the Ukraine. Lord

knows the President of the United States has enough on his plate, and he is trying to make the right decisions about what to do in giving assistance to the Ukrainian people and to the Ukrainian army to hold off Vladimir Putin's troops that are masquerading as rebels but, in fact, are bringing in Russian equipment and Russian soldiers who put on different uniforms. It is because of that that I think the wise choice would be for the United States to give lethal armaments to the Ukrainian people.

I was there in August. I spoke with all the members of the government—the Prime Minister, the Defense Minister, the Foreign Minister, the head of their Defense Council. At the time, I was surprised that they did not ask for lethal assistance but instead wanted up-to-the-minute intelligence, which was so important, and training. If my memory serves me correctly, in the Defense bill we provided about \$350 million for that assistance. But the question of lethal armaments so that they can withstand the Russian tanks—if we want them to be successful—is exceptionally important in this Senator's mind and point of view.

There is another reason. Mrs. Merkel is in town today, and her position is that she does not want Europe to provide lethal assistance. Well, Germany, of course, is not sharing a geographic line with the former Soviet Union, now Russia, and Germany is not feeling the heat, even though a major component and member of NATO, like so many of the other NATO members farther to the east.

Some of the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania—have substantial Russian populations. They are frightened of the realistic possibility of Putin, who has successfully taken a Russian-speaking part of Ukraine—namely, Crimea, which fell into his hand like a ripe plum—now moving on other parts of eastern Ukraine to establish a land bridge down to Crimea. What they fear is that suddenly the Russian army will amass on their border and use as a pretext, as Putin has done in eastern Ukraine, the coming in and rescuing and protecting of the Russian-speaking elements of those particular countries, particularly in the Baltics. There is a huge percentage of the population in Estonia that is Russian, likewise in Latvia and also Lithuania.

I met with the President of Lithuania, a woman whom a lot of people refer to in very admiring terms as a tough cookie, and that is apparent when you meet her. But the concerns about the Russian aggression are clearly there. They are very concerned that if eastern Ukraine falls, they will be next.

I think that is another reason that these courageous people who, after the break up of the Soviet Union, had so many years of corruption and bad government—now having thrown off the shackles of corruption, having a new

government after all of those protests in the center of the capital city of Ukraine—I think it is incumbent upon us to help that little country defend itself against Russian aggression. When a Russian tank is bearing down on you, you need something that can penetrate the steel armor of that tank in order to stop that tank and all the other tanks from advancing.

I will stop right there and shift gears.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, the clock is ticking at the Department of Homeland Security, and we are about to run out of money. We will run out of money at the end of this month. If we get into a situation where the Department that is tasked with the protection of national security here at home does not have the funding to protect our borders, to protect the central location that directs our defense against cyber attacks, to protect us as we get on airplanes through TSA, and to patrol the waters of the coastal United States through our Coast Guard—if we don't have the money appropriated, then that, to this Senator, is inexcusable.

This is all over a dispute about immigration because some people want to have it their way and only their way, and therefore, they cannot stand that the President has the legal authority to issue an Executive order. That is not the way to protect ourselves against all of these adversaries.

When I came to Washington as a young Congressman many moons ago, it was very clearly understood that partisan politics stopped at the water's edge. When it came to matters of national security, there were no partisan politics. When it came to matters of foreign policy, there were no partisan politics. Oh my, how times have changed. Now, with the injection of ideological politics, it is time for us to move on.

DISCOVERY SATELLITE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, the third and last subject I wish to address is the launch of a major spacecraft/satellite which will be for the interest of the United States and the free world. Hopefully, that will take place tomorrow evening around 6 p.m.

I was at the Cape last night thinking that the Discovery satellite was going to be launched atop a Falcon rocket on pad 40 at the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station. All systems were go, save for the radar system on the eastern test range of the Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center. The radar system went down, and they obviously cannot launch a rocket if they can't track it precisely, just in case it were to err from its course and had to be destroyed. So it was postponed. It has now been rescheduled for tomorrow night at approximately 6 p.m.

Why is this important? It is important because there are three major instruments. There are many more, but I will only mention three. No. 1, it will constantly aim an instrument at the Sun so when there is an additional solar explosion, which is a nuclear explosion on the face of the Sun, and all that additional radiation starts coming in what is known as solar wind to the United States, we can prepare for that nuclear radiation and save our satellites, save certain electrical grid systems, and warn pilots who are flying a route over the poles where the magnetic field of the Earth does not protect and repel against the nuclear radiation coming from the Sun, which is extremely important to commercial satellites, commercial systems on the ground, and is especially important to our military warning satellites.

We are fortunate there is a satellite that was put up in the late 1990s. Its acronym is ACE. It had a design life of 5 years, which would have been the early 2000s. This little satellite keeps producing. It measures the solar wind, or nuclear radiation, coming from the Sun about every 40 minutes. It was supposed to have been dead years ago. It is still perking.

This satellite will replace it and will warn us of a nuclear blast—not every 40 minutes but much more rapidly, like every 1 or 2 minutes, which will give us the ability to save our systems on the ground and in orbit. That is one instrument.

Now, since this payload will be at a neutrally buoyant point where the Earth's gravitational pull stops and the Sun's gravitational pull stops—called the Lagrangian Point No. 1, or L-1, between the Earth and the Sun—which is a little less than 1 million miles from the Earth, and because the gravitational pull of the Sun is much greater—it is about 92 million miles from the Sun—it will stay there and constantly look at the Sun in one direction, and in the other direction it looks at the Earth.

These are the other two instruments. One instrument will constantly measure the heat coming from the Sun that is being absorbed by the Earth, and that instrument then also measures the amount of heat that is reflected off of the Earth and radiated back out into space.

So if you want to measure exactly how the Earth is heating up, you get this very precise measurement of what is being absorbed minus what is being radiated back out into space, and you will know exactly how much heat the Earth is absorbing and how this planet is heating up.

The final instrument is one that was conceived of by then-Vice President Al Gore, who at my invitation was there yesterday. I don't know if he is going to be able to stay over until tomorrow to see the launch.

What Al Gore knew was that 42 years ago was the last time we had a full sunlit picture of the Earth. It was by the

Apollo 17 astronauts on the face of the moon. They got the Earth just at the exact time. They were able to photograph one-half of the Earth, which was lit by the Sun behind the astronauts on the moon. That was the last time we had a full, live picture of the Earth.

We have had many other pictures, but what they are is a strip here and a snippet there, and they are all stitched together—even though they were taken at different times—to make a composite of what the Earth looks like.

What the satellite Discovery will do, as its camera looks straight back at Earth, taking about 13 photographs in a 24-hour period, since the satellite is between the Earth and the Sun, it is able to look back with the telephoto lens and it will always see the sunlit side of the entire side of the Earth as it rotates on its axis every 24 hours and as it rotates around the Sun every 365 days. That will give us a new perspective of the overview effect of what this home that we call planet Earth is and what it looks like on a daily basis every 2 hours.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, the Keystone legislation is likely to move to the President's desk this week after the House takes it up, and he will veto it. The votes are not there to override a veto, either in the Senate or the House. Legislation has a natural lifecycle, and this piece of legislation is reaching the end of its lifecycle. This debate is almost over.

So where are we when it comes to American energy policy? The debate that occurred on Keystone was no doubt an important one, but it was exactly upside down. Congress and the media treated the Keystone bill as if it would settle American energy policy once and for all, when in fact it was and is a tiny sliver of debate. American energy policy is not defined by one project or one piece of infrastructure, however contentious it may be.

In order to have a real energy conversation, we have to agree on the facts, and this body cannot be the only place where there is a lack of consensus on the basic facts. That is why Senator WHITEHOUSE's amendment, my amendment, Senator HOEVEN's amendment, and those of many others were so important.

Last month's climate votes were illuminating and encouraging. First, Senator WHITEHOUSE's language, which simply stated that climate change was not a hoax, received a nearly unanimous vote. Believe it or not, that is progress. My amendment, which stated that climate change is real, caused by humans, and has real and significant impacts, received a bare majority of the votes, with five Republicans supporting it. Senator HOEVEN's amendment had similar language, as well as

some pro-Keystone language, and it attracted a dozen or so Republican votes.

What is the significance of all of this? It is very simple. Without acknowledging the problem, we cannot even begin to work on it. The wall of denial has begun to crack. So now we have a majority—and depending on how it is phrased, even a potential supermajority—in the Senate saying that climate change is real.

Now, most every serious person in public life either admits the basic facts of climate change or is on their way to getting there, and that is a good thing. Now the question is: What should we do? Given our regional differences, ideological differences, and the partisan divide, what comes next?

Later this year or next, we will see efforts to repeal a number of important environmental rules, especially the administration's clean power plan, which will regulate carbon pollution from existing and new powerplants, but that too is highly unlikely to result in anything other than a Presidential veto.

So are there any areas for potential common ground?

I think we saw real glimmers of hope and possibility during the Keystone debate. Several of my Republican colleagues made the argument during the debate on Keystone that while climate change is a real problem, we must be aware of how energy costs influence economic activity.

I could not agree more. We don't hear this often from folks on my side of the debate, but price matters. No climate policy is a real solution unless it strengthens both the national and global economies. As we pursue clean energy, we must understand its impacts on consumers—especially individuals and families in lower income communities—as well as businesses. We miss an opportunity to find common ground if we move too quickly past the questions of cost and the social and economic context in which this transition is going to occur.

We can contend with these challenges in Congress through a legislative solution. We can create incentives, create market-based mechanisms, look at regional differences, and fund R&D to help develop new and less-expensive solutions. EPA certainly has the authority and the obligation under the law to regulate carbon and other greenhouse gases. I support the President's Clean Power Plan because carbon pollution is real and it ought to be regulated under the Clean Air Act. If we want to be more comprehensive and if we want to be more nuanced and more flexible and more responsive to communities, we need a bill. Structured properly, a bill has the advantage of creating economically efficient solutions that can reduce carbon pollution from a much wider range of sources. That is why a well-designed fee on carbon is critical for our economy and our environment.

I understand the politics are nearly impossible right now, but if we think

about our ability as legislators to remunerate communities struggling during a transition, to ameliorate certain economic challenges, we may agree that legislating provides us the tools to achieve greater pollution reductions at a much lower social and economic cost. So once the Clean Power Plan is established, once it is litigated, and once it is full-on reality, I believe there may be room for compromise.

One more point on the issue of price. We have to do our calculations on an all-in basis. That includes tax expenditures, environmental damage, health impacts, and other so-called externalities. There is plenty of good research which indicates that clean energy technology is already competitive with fossil fuel technology when all costs are added in. Additionally, the cost of solar, wind, and energy efficiency is dropping precipitously and in many places is competing successfully in the free market, even before we consider the costs of pollution.

We will have a couple of battles that are unavoidable—on the Clean Power Plan and likely another run at Keystone—but there are a couple of areas that in my view don't have to be a battle. They are energy efficiency and energy research.

We ought to start with the Shaheen-Portman energy efficiency legislation. I have little doubt that Democrats would support this as a stand-alone bill. Energy efficiency is just common sense, and the energy experts remind us of an idea our mothers and fathers taught us growing up: waste not, want not. In other words, the straightest line toward saving money for people, businesses, and institutions is to help them adopt the latest energy efficiency practices and technologies.

Even this has unfortunately become a partisan issue in the last several Congresses with people worried that light bulb efficiency standards were part of some Orwellian plot. But that is not what these Department of Energy standards do, and it is not what Shaheen-Portman does.

At its core, energy efficiency is simply this: Use less but get the same result. Using less means paying less. Getting the same result means not having to sacrifice our way of life. The idea is not to ask people to do without, the idea is to just get more for our money. It is an old-school, conservative idea. Of course the Shaheen-Portman bill doesn't cost the taxpayers a dime, and projections are that it will create nearly 200,000 jobs.

I also think there is a lot of room for good bipartisan work in advanced technology research in the energy space—the kind the Department of Energy did for the State of Hawaii in developing a grid system that can accommodate unprecedented levels of intermittent renewable energy, the kind that made major advances in hydraulic fracturing, the kind that has helped the price of solar panels drop 80 percent since 2008, the kind that is making

breakthroughs in battery storage, which has fallen in price by 40 percent since 2010, and the kind that is working on carbon capture and sequestration.

America must lead on energy, and that requires us to do the kind of basic research that private companies can eventually use. A relatively small increase in research funding—both on the fossil and renewable side—has been shown to make an enormous impact on our economy. Investments in renewable and fossil fuel electricity generation, distribution, and transmission systems, grid stability and security, and fuel systems will enable America to lead in energy for decades to come.

These are the kinds of investments we would see in a comprehensive energy bill. I was so encouraged last week that the chairwoman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the Senator from Alaska, has indicated her desire to pursue comprehensive legislation this Congress. The Senator from Alaska is a very skilled bipartisan legislator, and I am looking forward to working with her on these issues. I am especially encouraged by her openness to climate provisions as part of that bill, something she mentioned as recently as last week. Just as she has listened to the concerns I and others have raised about climate change during the Keystone debate, so should we listen to her call for reliable, affordable, clean, and diverse energy supplies.

Several energy proposals contained within the President's fiscal year budget could become a part of a bipartisan bill, including ideas to more fully promote carbon capture and sequestration technologies and protect coal workers and their communities as we transition. The concerns of communities that have coal-based economies are real and legitimate and I believe any true climate solution must prioritize solutions for every American. The President recognized that and proposed \$55 million next year to help affected communities diversify their economies, offer job training, and ensure a good transition.

This will require compromise. It will require those of us on the left to concede that fossil fuels aren't going to disappear instantaneously, and it will require those on the right to recognize that investing in clean energy technologies doesn't necessarily mean picking winners and losers. We have wind energy in nearly all States—in fact, more in Republican than in Democratic States—and we have tea party members everywhere who love the freedom and liberty that distributed generation—rooftop solar—offers. We also have clean energy progressives, including myself, who understand that we have to deal with the energy system we have, not the one we wish we had.

The areas I have mentioned are not the only opportunities for bipartisan compromise, but we do need to start a dialogue, either on the floor, in committees or in informal discussions, about what we can actually do. As we consider a policy solution, let's ask the

following questions: Can it be enacted into law? Will it advance American energy security? Will it strengthen the economy and provide economic growth? Will it reduce pollution?

There are a few areas where we are going to fight—there is no avoiding it—and that is OK. But there is, for the first time since I arrived, a glimmer of hope that we may be able to find common ground on some of these issues and begin a serious discussion about tackling American energy policy and climate change.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, this is the first time I have come to the floor to speak on this issue while the Senator from Iowa has been presiding. Over the last 2 years, since the mass tragedy in my State, in Sandy Hook, CT, I have come to the floor once every week or so to give voice to victims of gun violence all across this country. I have told the story of the beautiful 6- and 7-year-olds as well as the teachers and professionals who were killed that day.

The fact is that every day across this country there are two to three Sandy Hooks that happen. There are 86 people killed by guns every day in this country, 2,600 a month, and over 30,000 a year. The statistics, unfortunately, have not compelled this body to action. We have done nothing—zero—about this national tragedy since Sandy Hook. That is a stain upon the conscience of this body that is impossible to erase. My hope is that by coming to the floor and speaking about who these people actually are, maybe it will prompt us to have a conversation about how we can make sure these numbers aren't eliminated; they are never going to go away but to make sure they are lower, that they are less than these numbers, the highest in the developed world.

Let me speak first about an extraordinary young man, 44 years old, who was killed on January 20—just about 2 weeks ago—in Boston, MA. His name was Dr. Michael Davidson. He was shot by a gunman who walked into Brigham and Women's Hospital. The gunman was the relative of someone who had been under the care of Dr. Davidson who clearly had some major illness that prompted him to think he could solve his grief by shooting the doctor who had cared for his loved one. Dr. Davidson was known at Brigham and Women's Hospital for his gentle way

with patients and their families and his willingness to operate on the most delicate hearts. He used to lie awake at night worrying about his patients. He was always receiving letters about the great care he provided. He wanted to be a cardiovascular surgeon from the time he was a little boy, which is a pretty exceptional thing. As renowned as he was as a physician, what he truly will be remembered for was for being a father to three children, and he and his wife were waiting for their fourth to arrive, due this April.

At his funeral nearly 1,000 people were there to hear his wife say:

By now, you've all heard that my husband, Michael Davidson, was a superb physician. Perhaps, most importantly, he cared immensely for his patients and their families. That is why the fact that a patient's family member would take Michael away from us makes it all the more devastating.

A brilliant surgeon and a wonderful father taken away from us at age 44 in Boston, MA.

Everyone by now has heard the story from December 20, where two New York City police officers were killed by a mentally ill man who drove to New York with the intention of killing police officers. Wenjian Liu had been in this country almost 20 years to the day—an American dream story personified. His family came to this country from China to seek a better life. He came here on Christmas Eve, 1994. He wanted to be a police officer because he wanted to give back to his community. Liu once said:

I know that being a cop is dangerous but I must do it. If I don't do it and you don't do it, then who is going to do it?

It is that kind of commitment that was shown by him that day by the very fact that he was in the car. He wasn't scheduled to work, but he volunteered to work a fill-in shift when a fellow officer was late. That is just how he was.

Rafael Ramos, otherwise known as Ralph Ramos, was in that car as well. He wanted to be a police officer so badly that when he was preparing to join the police academy, he took a petition door to door throughout his whole neighborhood asking for his neighbors to testify to his character. He is remembered as a good police officer but also as someone who shoveled all the sidewalks in his neighborhood, took his two boys to a nearby park over and over to play basketball, always with a smile on his face. He was hours away from becoming a lay chaplain. One of his dreams was to go into the ministry. He is remembered by friends and family as someone committed to his family, committed to his job, but also committed to his faith.

These two police officers were killed by a man named Ismaaiyl Brinsley. He was a deeply mentally ill man, someone who had tried to commit suicide and who had become completely isolated from his family and from his peers. When I read his story, it struck me as not completely dissimilar from the story in Newtown, CT, Adam

Lanza. Adam Lanza was a deeply troubled, deeply mentally ill young man who became isolated from his peers and from his family. We can't completely understand what caused him to do what he did that day, nor what Mr. Brinsley was thinking in his head when he drove to New York to carry out those heinous murders.

What we know is we have largely abandoned the mentally ill in this country. We lock them up in prisons rather than treating their underlying illnesses. Over the course of the last half a decade, 4,000 inpatient psychiatric beds have been closed all across this country, forcing more of the mentally ill out on the streets and into prison and into crisis. You know, the Federal law authorizing the funding we send to mental health work in this country—SAMHSA, that is the agency—has not been reauthorized in a decade. We haven't even debated mental health policy on the floor of this Senate for a decade. No wonder we have a system that is in crisis.

It means in the absence of Federal leadership, private organizations are stepping up to the plate. Sandy Hook promised—the group of parents of many of those children who were killed has taken up a cause called No One Eats Alone. It is a wonderful cause in which students in high school, middle school, and elementary school cafeterias are asked to seek out one or two children who often eat alone, who are socially isolated at school, and to reach out and do small things such as sitting with them during lunch to remove some sense of social isolation that comes often with children who bring mental illness or learning disabilities to school.

That effort is admirable, and it will make a difference. But it speaks to the fact those groups have to step in and do things such as the No One Eats Alone campaign because Congress isn't stepping up to the plate and doing anything about these numbers: 31,000 a year, 2,600 a month, 86 a day. You know what my feelings are on this. I don't think it is just about mental health programming and funding. I think it is ridiculous 90 percent of Americans think you should have to go through a background check in order to buy a gun, yet we still won't move forward with expanded background checks, and the majority of Americans think that dangerous assault weapons should be for the police and for our military and not be able to get into the hands of young, troubled men such as Adam Lanza to be used in mass murder.

In the absence over the next 2 years of our ability to come to an agreement on changing our gun laws so they reflect where the vast majority of the American public is, let's at least take on the mental health crisis in this country. Let's at least decide we are going to plus-up resources for community mental health providers. We are going to rebuild inpatient capacity. We are going to recognize that as angry as

we are at people such as Ismaaiyl Brinsley and of young men such as Adam Lanza, there is a story there of neglect that if we address we can lower these numbers even without changes over the next 2 years in our—I would argue—very backward national background check laws.

I thank you for listening and some of my colleagues for being on the floor today. I know we have a number of people who want to speak. I will continue to come to the floor so my colleagues can hear the stories of people such as Officer Ramos, Officer Liu, and heroes such as Dr. Michael Davidson so that maybe the voices of these victims can prompt us to action.

I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION ON USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, along with Senator HATCH, we have a concern we want to share with this body. One of the reasons I do is because I had planned to go ahead and introduce the bill having to do with the AUMF. In fact, I actually had introduced it a year ago, but I understand now we are coming into an agreement and Senator HATCH and I stand together to speak about the need for the new AUMF, authorization for use of military force, against the terrorist organization known as ISIS or ISIL, or whatever you want to call it, in order to answer any legal question as to the authority the President has to defend the American people and demonstrate our commitment to the global coalition in defeating this radical Islamic organization.

I have always contended the President had this authority anyway. In fact, I can remember a year ago he said he did. I now understand the President will be sending to Congress his own version of the AUMF this week. I will read it with interest.

Over the past 6 months, ISIS, or ISIL, has expanded its control in Iraq and Syria. They continue to recruit followers worldwide. We saw just the other day what happened when we had the King of Jordan here and we had the opportunity to be with him when he got the very sad news of what happened to his F-16 pilot being burned alive. It happened to be with him in Syria just a month before that. I am talking about with the King of Jordan.

We know firsthand what is going on. It is my hope the President's proposed AUMF will include all the authorities needed to execute his strategy to stop ISIS and the President provides Congress with that strategy as part of any approval for an AUMF.

The President's proposed AUMF should not contain restrictions on U.S. forces or time or geographic limitations. An AUMF should authorize the use of all necessary and appropriate force anywhere where ISIS or any successor organization is operating until we accomplish our strategy.

At the State of the Union speech last month, President Obama specifically said—and I am quoting now:

I call on this Congress to show the world that we are united in this mission by passing a resolution to authorize the use of force against ISIL. We need that authority.

That was a quote from his State of the Union Message. Quite frankly, he had already stated before he had that authority. I am not going to argue about that. Let's just make sure to eliminate all doubts.

Subsequent official White House statements have called for a "right-sized, modernized AUMF...it would send a powerful signal to the citizens of this country, the citizens of our allies, and to our enemies."

It was on January 23 that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Dempsey said—and I am going to quote General Dempsey's entire quote because I think he is the No. 1 guy. He is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the one who should be the best qualified to make these decisions.

He said:

I think in the crafting of the AUMF, all options should be on the table, and then we can debate whether we want to use them. But the authorization should be there...In particular, it shouldn't constrain activities geographically, because ISIL knows no boundaries, [and] doesn't recognize any boundaries—in fact it's their intention to erase all boundaries to their benefit. Constraints on time, or a "sunset clause," I just don't think it's necessary. I think the nation should speak of its intent to confront this radical ideological barbaric group and leave the option until we can deal with it.

That is all a quote from General Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think we need to listen to it. I don't think the immediate need for an AUMF could be put more clearly or succinctly than General Dempsey's words, and it is my hope he was intimately involved in the drafting of the administration's AUMF.

It is my understanding we will see this tomorrow. Again, I, along with many colleagues—including my good friend from Utah—look forward to reading President Obama's AUMF. We have to get rid of this monster.

With that, I yield to my good friend from Utah.

NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

MR. HATCH. Madam President, today I rise with my friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, to discuss some of the most pressing national security issues the Senate is poised to confront. These matters include the confirmation of Ashton Carter as Secretary of Defense, whose nomination I strongly support; and Senator AYOTTE's Guantanamo Bay detainee transfer bill, of which I am a cosponsor. Indeed, I applaud the expeditious consideration of Senator AYOTTE's bill in the Armed Services Committee under the leadership of Senator MCCAIN.

These moves come at a critically important time as we continue to witness the spectacles of barbarism perpetrated by the so-called Islamic State, or ISIS—aid workers and journalists gruesomely beheaded; Christians tortured and murdered for refusing to convert; and most recently, a captured coalition pilot burned alive.

These acts are just a glimpse of the undiluted savagery unleashed by this terrorist organization on the large swath of territory in Iraq and Syria that it controls. Even beyond its horrific human rights violations, the Islamic State threatens to destabilize the entire Middle East and it is attempting to undo all that was accomplished by our servicemembers in 8 years of blood and sacrifice in Iraq.

Most troubling of all, the Islamic State serves as a safe haven for terrorist training and planning, similar to Afghanistan prior to the September 11 attacks. With the Islamic State's stated intention to "raise the flag of Allah in the White House" and kill "hundreds of millions" in a worldwide "religious cleansing," there can be no doubt this organization poses a clear and present danger to the national security of the United States and to our allies, not only in the Middle East but throughout the world. Accordingly, we must fight and defeat this dangerous terrorist organization.

It is therefore incumbent upon us as legislators to ensure we provide all the tools necessary for defeating the enemy. Personally, I agree with the Obama administration's previous determination that the President has ample powers to conduct operations against the Islamic State under article II of the Constitution as well as the existing authorizations for the use of military force passed by Congress in 2001 against Al Qaeda and the Taliban in 2002 for Iraq. Nevertheless, I agree with the President that Congress should authorize the use of force against the Islamic State, not only to put to rest any legal questions about the President's power to use force, but also to demonstrate to the world America's resolve in this fight against terror.

If we are to pass a new authorization for use of military force, it is critically important to ensure that this new law is properly crafted. It will define against whom and under what conditions our Nation may direct its national might.

Therefore, Senator INHOFE and I feel compelled to propose general principles that we believe should guide this effort, especially since it appears the President will send his own draft to Congress shortly. Senator INHOFE and I are offering these thoughts with no intention to undermine careful consideration of the President's proposal by the Senate's national security committees.

Furthermore, we do not at all wish to complicate the efforts to reach consensus by laying down demands. Far from it. Rather, our intent is to facili-

tate the legislative process by outlining some of the elements we believe to be most crucial for ensuring the success of our servicemembers as they confront this great evil.

First, the authorization should clearly articulate that the executive branch is authorized to use force—employed in accordance with the law of armed conflict—against the Islamic State.

Second, the authorization should be flexible enough to be utilized not only against the Islamic State as it appears today, but also in whatever form the organization takes going forward. This flexibility should also include the authority to use force against organizations that are associated with or materially supporting the Islamic State.

Finally, and most importantly, the authorization should not impose any artificial and unnecessary limitations—such as those based on time, geography, and type of force—that could interfere with our strategic objective of defeating the Islamic State.

Unfortunately, many have suggested including such artificial limitations on the use of force in a future authorization. Specifically, many have discussed prohibiting the use of ground forces as well as providing an expiration date for the authorization. These are restrictions the Islamic State could use to its advantage. If we are telling the Islamic State upfront we will not use ground forces, will they not tailor their strategy around that fact? If we advertise when the authorization expires at an arbitrary date and time, will they not hunker down and wait for that date? Why would we not only unilaterally impose limitations as to which types of tools and tactics our servicemembers can use, but then also broadcast those limitations to the enemy?

Indeed, we believe that Congress and the President should heed the advice of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who stated in an interview on January 23, 2015, that:

I think in the crafting of the AUMF, all options should be on the table, and then we can debate whether we want to use them. But the authorization should be there. . . . In particular, it shouldn't constrain activities geographically, because ISIL knows no boundaries [and] doesn't recognize any boundaries—in fact it's their intention to erase all boundaries to their benefit. . . . Constraints on time, or a "sunset clause," I just don't think it's necessary. I think the nation should speak of its intent to confront this radical ideological barbaric group and leave the option until we can deal with it.

Senators INHOFE and I could not agree more. We hope the Congress will enact a new authorization based on the principles we are outlining here today. I want to thank him. I hope our colleagues will take this seriously and hopefully we can turn this mess around.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL P. BOTTICELLI TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Michael P. Botticelli, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Millions of American families are struggling with an unrelenting addiction to controlled substances. This is nothing new and that is the unfortunate part about it. But after decades of taking the wrong path toward treating drug abuse, it appears that we are finally in the midst of a fundamental shift in the way we are going to focus and approach this issue.

For years we simply considered drug abuse as a crime, to be dealt with by police, prosecutors, and prisons. There is now, however, a near consensus that addiction must be viewed as a public health issue. This requires coordinated investments in prevention and treatment. Law enforcement agencies would rather not arrest the same offenders over and over without dealing with the underlying addiction. Treating that addiction—rather than just punishing the addict—is often the more effective, more humane, and less costly approach.

There is perhaps no greater advocate for this shift in thinking than Michael Botticelli. Throughout his career in public health he has worked to bridge gaps between law enforcement, health care, and education providers. As acting director for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, ONDCP, he has made clear that we cannot “incarcerate addiction out of people.” While

law enforcement will always play a vital role in protecting citizens from drug-related crime, Mr. Botticelli recognizes that addiction is a disease—one that can be successfully prevented and treated using the same evidence-based approach we use for other public health challenges.

Mr. Botticelli's nomination was reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote last year and again last week. I am pleased that he continued to receive strong, bipartisan support from the full Senate here today. As director of ONDCP, Mr. Botticelli will help to coordinate drug-control activities across the Federal Government. This includes critical efforts such as administering funding for Drug-Free Communities grants and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. It is no small task. Just last week, the President requested over \$12 billion for demand reduction programs. This represents the largest commitment to treating and preventing drug addiction in our Nation's history, and it is badly needed.

Much of the country is now confronting a rising challenge: addiction to heroin and powerful painkillers. My home State of Vermont has not been spared, and it has attracted much attention for its struggles with opioid abuse. In fact, the film “The Hungry Heart” provides a powerful portrayal of the damage this addiction has inflicted on Vermont families. I was honored to host a screening of this moving film with Michael Botticelli last May.

However in many ways, Vermont is ahead of the Nation. We in Vermont long ago recognized the problem and began developing new approaches to address it. Dedicated Vermonters working in the traditional roles of prevention, treatment, and law enforcement came together around common goals and shared strategies. These community partnerships have produced innovative and successful programs such as the Rapid Intervention Community Court in Burlington, and Project VISION in Rutland. Last year, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing in Vermont on this issue. As a lifelong Vermonter, what hit me is how everybody came together for this hearing—Republicans, Democrats, Independents, law enforcement, defense counsels, clergy, teachers, medical professionals, parents and often those who have been abusers. We all realize there is no single answer, but we can do it better than we have for decades.

First responders are saving the lives of addicts throughout the State by carrying naloxone. This will save their life instead of some who would die of an overdose. Evidence-based prevention and treatment services have been extended to all corners of Vermont, and barriers to recovery have been significantly reduced. That is the most important part.

These are all strategies that the ONDCP promotes. Mr. Botticelli understands that success requires an in-

creased commitment to early intervention and education, treatment, and smart criminal justice policies. While the scope of the challenge is immense, Mr. Botticelli has us going in the right direction. Having listened to him, having talked to him, I am really hopeful he will help get us ahead of addiction, and help end the misery it inflicts on individuals, families, and our communities. I urge my fellow Senators to vote for his immediate confirmation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for Michael Botticelli as nominee to be the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mr. Botticelli has more than two decades of experience supporting those who have been affected by substance use and abuse.

Prior to joining the Office of National Drug Control Policy in 2012, when he was confirmed as the Deputy Director, Mr. Botticelli served as the director of the Bureau of Substance Abuse Services at the Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

While there, he expanded prevention, treatment, and recovery services, and worked to implement evidence-based programs, including a youth treatment system, early intervention and treatment programs, and overdose prevention programs.

During Mr. Botticelli's tenure as director of the Bureau of Substance Abuse Services, he confronted the issues of heroin and prescription drug abuse head-on and worked to ensure that police officers in Quincy, MA were trained and equipped to resuscitate overdose victims using naloxone, an emergency opioid overdose reversal medication.

Since October 2010, Quincy police officers have administered naloxone 220 times, almost always resulting in successful overdose reversal. This program has been replicated in communities throughout the country.

As chairman of the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, I had the opportunity to work closely with Mr. Botticelli during his time as Deputy Director and Acting Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Most recently, Mr. Botticelli testified at a hearing I chaired to address America's addiction to prescription opioids and heroin, where he emphasized the need for increased prescriber education to reduce prescription drug abuse and expanded access to naloxone nationwide.

In addition, Mr. Botticelli has committed to working with my office to address the import, manufacture, and distribution of dangerous synthetic drugs, which take far too many lives, far too early. At a previous hearing on the topic, he provided valuable insight into the threat that synthetic drugs pose and it is my hope that we can continue to work together as the Senate considers legislation to address this threat.

Mr. Botticelli has also been very clear about the fact that marijuana remains illegal under the Federal Controlled Substances Act, and has done much to disavow the notion that marijuana is harmless.

As a person in recovery himself, Mr. Botticelli brings a unique perspective to the Office of National Drug Control Policy. I believe this perspective will enable him to successfully implement a national drug control strategy that recognizes the need for both supply and demand reduction and appropriately incorporates an effective public health approach that is coupled with law enforcement efforts.

I look forward to continuing to work with Mr. Botticelli as he leads the Office of National Drug Control Policy in implementing a whole of government approach to combatting illegal and illicit drug use.

I believe Michael Botticelli will serve with distinction as the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, and I urge my colleagues to confirm his nomination.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michael P. Botticelli, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy?

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Alexander	Blunt	Cantwell
Ayotte	Booker	Capito
Baldwin	Boozman	Cardin
Barrasso	Boxer	Carper
Bennet	Brown	Casey
Blumenthal	Burr	Cassidy

Coats	Hirono	Portman
Collins	Inhofe	Reed
Coons	Isakson	Reid
Corker	Johnson	Risch
Cornyn	Kaine	Rounds
Cotton	King	Rubio
Crapo	Kirk	Sanders
Cruz	Klobuchar	Sasse
Daines	Lankford	Schatz
Donnelly	Leahy	Schumer
Durbin	Lee	Scott
Enzi	Manchin	Sessions
Ernst	Markey	Shaheen
Feinstein	McCaskill	Shelby
Fischer	McConnell	Stabenow
Flake	Menendez	Sullivan
Franken	Merkley	Tester
Gardner	Mikulski	Thune
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Tillis
Graham	Murphy	Udall
Grassley	Murray	Warner
Hatch	Nelson	Warren
Heinrich	Paul	Whitehouse
Heitkamp	Perdue	Wyden
Heller	Peters	

NOT VOTING—8

Cochran	Moran	Vitter
Hoeben	Roberts	Wicker
McCain	Toomey	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CELEBRATING THE LUNAR NEW YEAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of the Lunar New Year, an important and festive holiday for people of Asian and Pacific Islander heritage around the world. Lunar New Year celebrations not only sustain important cultural traditions that have been practiced for centuries, but also provide a moment to reflect upon the many contributions made by the Asian and Pacific Islander community in Nevada and across the globe.

In my home State of Nevada, the Asian American community is among the fastest growing in the United States. From 2000 to 2010, the Asian American population in Nevada more than doubled. Chinese Americans, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders have greatly enriched Nevada's history and culture, and I am pleased to stand today in recognition of these communities as they prepare for the upcoming festivities.

This year, families and communities in Nevada and across the world will welcome the Year of the Sheep, and I

offer my warmest wishes for peace and prosperity in the coming year.

WHO'S THE BOSS? THE "JOINT EMPLOYER" STANDARD, AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESSES AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing last week be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S THE BOSS? THE "JOINT EMPLOYER" STANDARD, AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESSES AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH

This morning we are having a hearing about who qualifies as a joint employer in the National Labor Relations Board's view.

This hearing this morning is about a pending National Labor Relations Board decision that could destroy a small business opportunity for more than 700,000 Americans. These men and women are franchisees. They operate health clubs, barber shops, auto parts shops, child care centers, neighborhood restaurants, music stores, cleaning services, and much more. They use the brand name of companies like Planet Fitness, Merry Maids or Panera Bread. They may work 12 hours a day serving customers, meeting a payroll, dealing with government regulations, paying taxes, and trying to make a profit.

We live at a time when Democrats and Republicans bemoan the fact that it's getting harder and harder to climb the economic ladder of success in our country. Successfully operating a franchise business is today one of the most important ways to do that. Why would the pending decision by the National Labor Relations Board threaten this very American way of life, knocking the ladder out from under hundreds of thousands of Americans? The board and its General Counsel are pursuing a change to what is called the "joint employer" standard. This standard, or test, has since 1984 required that for a business to be considered a joint employer, it must hold direct control over the terms and conditions of a worker's employment—to decide that, the NLRB looks at who hires and fires, sets work hours, picks uniforms, issues directions to employees, determines compensation, handles day to day supervision, and conducts recordkeeping.

Under the changes the NLRB is now considering, it would take just indirect control over the employees' terms and conditions of employment, or even unexercised potential to control working conditions, or where "industrial realities" otherwise made it essential to meaningful collective bargaining.

So what could this mean for these more than 700,000 franchisees and employers? These franchise companies will find it much more practical to own all their stores and restaurants and day care centers themselves. There will be many more company-owned outposts, rather than franchisee-owned small businesses.

Franchisees tell me they expect "franchisors would be compelled to try to establish control over staffing decisions and daily operations. . . . franchisees would lose their independence and become de facto employees of the franchisor."

This case doesn't just affect franchisees, it will affect every business that uses a subcontractor or contracts out for any service.

That includes most of the 5.7 million businesses under NLRB jurisdiction in America—because most businesses contract for some service.

Consider a local bicycle shop that contracts out its cleaning service under a cost plus provision, in which the cleaner is paid for all of its expenses to a certain limit, plus a profit. If this arrangement is interpreted to create “indirect control” or have “unexercised potential” over working conditions—they could trigger joint employer obligations. Same thing with a local restaurant that outsources all of its baked goods under a contract that includes penalties for being late or delivering substandard goods—it could be considered a joint employer of the bakery employees.

What does it mean to be a joint employer? First, you are required to engage in collective bargaining, and are on the hook for all of the agreements made in collective bargaining, such as salaries, healthcare coverage, and pension obligations. It often takes weeks or months of an employer's time and hefty legal costs to negotiate agreements.

Being considered a joint employer also eliminates protection from what are called “secondary boycotts.” Current law does not allow a union to boycott companies that do business with their employer in an attempt to apply to pressure to their employer. If the secondary company is instead deemed a joint employer, the union will be able to picket and boycott.

Imagine being an employer and having these legal, financial and time burdens placed upon you by a union representing employees you have no real control over.

Let me give another example—we have several large auto manufacturing plants in my home state of Tennessee. Let's say one of those plants has a few thousand employees, but thousands of other workers come in and out of the plant's gates every day to provide goods and services the facility needs to operate.

These workers are employed and directly controlled by subcontractors that provide security, supply auto parts, and staff the company lunch room. If the NLRB goes down this road, the plant owner could be forced to sit at dozens of different collective bargaining tables—and be responsible for another employer's obligations.

So the manufacturer would likely take as much “in house” as it can—and if that move comes at the cost of efficiency and innovation the plant could be relocated elsewhere. This example is especially concerning to me because more than 100,000 Tennesseans are employed in the auto manufacturing industry.

As for the subcontractors, they would be losing huge clients, which would in turn jeopardize more jobs and threaten these businesses' futures.

Most business owners are people who wanted to run their own business, be their own boss, and live their dream of providing a much-needed service in their community.

This pending decision would ruin that dream for many.

WEST JEFFERSON, NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the town of West Jefferson, NC. Today, February 9 is the 100th anniversary of the charter of this historical town that has become a vibrant community attracting tourists, artists, entrepreneurs, retirees and young families.

Development of rural farmland into a town resulted from extending a rail-

road line into it. Construction of roadbeds and trestles for the steel rails took place in 1914, and depots were created as loading spots. When people of this area learned that the railroad was coming, speculators made investments in villages that would be affected. A new village was also created. The West Jefferson Land Company mapped a farming area in a valley between two mountains and sold lots for commercial and residential uses. Developers and their purchasers were ready when the first train arrived. The West Jefferson depot was central and most prominent. As part of its official recognition by the State Legislature in 1915, the town acquired for its governance a mayor and aldermen.

Passenger service was added by the railroad company and enjoyed by many. Then, as the years went by, personal automobiles, paved roads, freight trucks and passenger buses created new transportation options. There were no more large tracts of virgin timber to be harvested. Railroad operation declined in profitability and the end came in 1977. The rails were taken up and trains became a romantic memory for the people of West Jefferson. Trains remain today as images which we see in the local history museum diorama and in some of the beautiful murals on downtown buildings. Murals, galleries, studios and dynamic programs now identify West Jefferson as an arts community, enhancing its image as a desirable place in which to live.

The town of West Jefferson has received many accolades for its business and family-friendly environment, low cost of living, lively rebirth of its downtown district, and many other aspects. I join the fine people of West Jefferson as its citizens and leaders celebrate this historic 100th anniversary.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GENE BESS

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to honor Coach Gene Bess of Three Rivers College in Poplar Bluff, MO. As a coach for Three Rivers College, Gene has had an amazing career that has spanned four decades. During that time, he has maintained a winning percentage of 78 percent with an average of 27 wins per year. He has not had a losing season since becoming Three Rivers College's head coach in 1971.

Coach Bess has led the Three Rivers College Raiders to 17 tournament appearances in the National Junior College Athletic Association, NJCAA tournament, where his career record is 41–19. The Raiders have reached the Final Four of the NJCAA tournament nine times, while winning national championships in 1979 and 1992.

Gene has been recognized as the NJCAA Coach of the Year twice, the Regional Coach of the Year on 18 occasions, and the Midwest Community College Athletic Conference Coach of

the Year 19 times. He is a member of the Poplar Bluff Sports Hall of Fame, the Missouri Sports Hall of Fame, and the NJCAA Hall of Fame.

Coach Bess is one of the best basketball coaches to ever blow a whistle in college basketball, and this month, he became the first college basketball coach ever to reach 1,200 victories. This is a tremendous feat for a coach in any sport, at any level.

Prior to his record-setting career at Three Rivers College, Coach Bess had a very successful record at the high school level when coaching at Lesterville, Anniston, and Oran. Over a 12-year period, these Bess-era teams won over 250 games, ending in appropriate fashion with his Oran team playing for the Missouri Class M State Championship. Oran lost that game 76–74, yet the Bess legacy was only beginning.

The leadership and dedication that Gene Bess demonstrates as a basketball coach, does not stop on the court. Instead, it translates into his personal and public life. He has been married for nearly 54 years and is a deacon at the First Baptist Church of Poplar Bluff. He and his wife Nelda have two children, Janell Hartmann and Brian, one of the Raiders' assistant coaches, and four grandchildren. Faith and family always come before his work, and this is just one secret to his success.

I ask that all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Coach Bess and the Three Rivers Raiders on this rare milestone of 1,200 victories, a record that is unsurpassed at any level.●

TRIBUTE TO HELENE GALEN

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize my great friend and an extraordinary philanthropist in my State, Helene Galen, who was honored over the weekend with the Desert AIDS Project's “100 Women Award.” Helene's immense contributions throughout California—especially in her beloved Coachella Valley—have left a legacy that will benefit the people of our State for decades to come.

She has worked tirelessly to fight child abuse through the Barbara Sinatra Children's Center for almost 30 years. Her strong support for Jewish Family Service of the Desert has provided critical social services to seniors, children and families throughout the area. A devoted advocate for people living with HIV and AIDS, she has been a leader of the Desert AIDS Project's “100 Women” program, which supports women and children affected by HIV and AIDS with food, housing and life-saving health care.

Whenever Helene sees an unmet need, she doesn't wait for someone else to step up. She jumps in with all her heart and all her passion. She led the effort to build a new performing arts center and theater at Rancho Mirage High School, which will ensure that generations of young people can pursue

their dreams. A longtime member of the University of Southern California School of Fine Arts' Board of Councilors, Helene and her late husband, Louis, were the driving force behind the construction of USC's Galen Center, an arena that opened in 2006 and has provided the community an incredible venue for sporting events, concerts, and school activities.

A former executive in the retail industry, Helene has used her financial savvy and management experience to benefit a host of charities and institutions. She has served on the boards of the Eisenhower Medical Center, the Palm Springs Art Museum, the McCallum Theatre, and the Palm Springs International Film Festival.

A devoted mother and grandmother, Helene truly embodies the saying in the Jewish tradition, "Whoever saves a life, it is as if that person has saved the whole world." Without a doubt, Helene's work has saved countless lives, and her impact will be felt in California for many years to come.●

RECOGNIZING THE ENERGY INNOVATION LABORATORY

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Idaho National Lab's Energy Innovation Laboratory, EIL, for the facility's selection as the 2014 Best Green Project in the Nation by the Engineering News-Record.

The recent award is among the growing list of recognitions the EIL is receiving for the innovative work at the lab. Engineering News-Record also recognized EIL as the Best Overall Inter-mountain Project for the States of Idaho, Utah and Montana. Additionally, EIL won the 2014 Go Beyond Award for the team's work to reduce the lab's environmental impacts. The lab is also among fewer than 5 percent of U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, LEED, registry research labs to be Platinum-certified.

EIL was completed in 2013 following the outstanding work of the EIL project team, led by Reed Miller of Ormond Builders and Kath Williams, the LEED coordinator, and in collaboration with INL's Project Management Office, Supply Chain Management and Campus Development Office. The new laboratory provides space for INL researchers to develop solutions to national energy challenges in advanced clean energy and related environmental science while also consolidating some of INL's research and development. I commend all those on the project team—including Ormond Builders Inc.; INL; Plan One/Architects; REL Facilities, LLC; Engineering System Solutions; and others—for their collaborative and conscientious work to establish this exceptional research facility that is mindful of our environment.

Energy efficiencies at the facility have resulted in its energy use being nearly half that of other conventionally-

designed laboratories. In addition to its impressive energy savings, the facility's design also reduces its water usage. Nearly all of the construction waste was recycled, reused or repurposed, and one-third of the facility was constructed using recycled materials.

Idahoans are leading the way in developing technological and scientific advancements that are beneficial around the world. The exceptional research and development being conducted at the Idaho National Laboratory is an asset to our State and Nation. I commend all those on the EIL project team for their forward-thinking work. Congratulations on receiving this award. I look forward to continuing to follow your success.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. OLIVIA J. HOOKER

● Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Olivia J. Hooker, a leader whose commitment to service has lifted the lives of many Americans. As the first African American woman to serve in Active Duty in the U.S. Coast Guard, and as a survivor of the Tulsa Race Riots and founder of the Tulsa Race Riot Commission, Dr. Hooker is a pioneer and role model for all to follow. I am especially proud to recognize Dr. Hooker on her centennial birthday.

During this momentous occasion, we celebrate the legacy of Dr. Olivia J. Hooker, whose strength and spirit have enriched our society.

Dr. Hooker was born in Oklahoma in 1915. In 1921, her community in Tulsa was destroyed in the worst race riot in United States history. The Tulsa Race Riot caused over 300 fatalities, as well as the burning of over 1,000 homes and businesses.

Following the riot, Dr. Hooker helped found the Tulsa Race Riot Commission. The commission served to draft recommendations for restitution. The advocacy of Dr. Hooker and her allies led them to testify before the Oklahoma State Legislature and U.S. Congress.

Dr. Hooker attended The Ohio State University after her family moved to Columbus, OH. After earning a bachelor's degree, Dr. Hooker applied to join the Navy, but was denied because of her race. Dr. Hooker then applied to join the Coast Guard, and became the first African American female to serve there. In 1942, Federal legislation created the U.S. Coast Guard Women's Reserve—the program known as SPAR. Dr. Hooker separated from the Coast Guard at the rank of petty officer 2nd class, with a Good Conduct Medal.

Dr. Hooker went on to earn her master's degree from Teachers College at Columbia University, and then a doctorate in psychology from the University of Rochester. Dr. Hooker had a long, remarkable career as a professor in New York. After retiring at the age of 87, she continues to inspire and support women joining the military, and

believes our country prospers because of its diversity.

Dr. Hooker broke barriers in our Nation. Her story inspires many people who have faced adversity and discrimination. Dr. Hooker's legacy, accomplishments, and spirit will live on in our Nation.●

RECOGNIZING JON PONDER

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Jon Ponder for his tireless effort in giving others hope for a brighter future. Mr. Ponder has dedicated many years to helping adults exiting various segments of the judicial system successfully reenter the workforce and their local communities, as well as rekindle relationships with their families. He has contributed greatly to the city of Las Vegas by founding HOPE for Prisoners, Inc., HOPE, which gives ex-offenders the support necessary to reduce the likelihood of returning to prison.

Mr. Ponder stands as a shining example of someone who has devoted his life to the betterment of others. He founded HOPE in January of 2012 and has since worked to create a strong program to successfully streamline men and women back into society. The program has graduated over 800 people through its leadership workshop who have gone on to successfully obtain full-time jobs. As founder and CEO, Mr. Ponder has contributed greatly to the success of the program.

HOPE services 12 agencies and offers life-skills training, work-readiness training, and job-development opportunities, encouraging those in the program to work hard to become a positive, contributing member of the community. Mr. Ponder has taken his own life experiences and used them in a positive manner to truly transform the lives of others. His ambition to help others is invaluable. He recently received the Leadership Award from the International Church of Las Vegas, a well-deserved honor for all of his hard work.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. Ponder for his selfless contributions to the Las Vegas community and the individuals that have benefited from HOPE. His service to Nevada places him among the outstanding men and women of the State.

Today, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing Mr. Ponder and his work for HOPE, a program with a mission that is both noble and necessary. I am honored to acknowledge Mr. Ponder and his tireless efforts to give others a second chance in Nevada. Giving these men and women the skills to allow them to change their circumstances is admirable, and I wish the program the best of luck in all of its future endeavors.●

REMEMBERING HENRY LEE FIELDS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate a Georgia first responder, public servant and leader, Chief Henry Lee Fields, who passed away on December 28, 2014.

• Chief Fields was born to Eddie Lee and Dorothea Johnson Fields on July 13, 1944, in Dougherty County, GA. He worked hard to graduate from Monroe High School in 1963, and attended Newark Community College before returning home in 1964 and working as an auto mechanic. He and his wife Dorothy Fields had two daughters, Rosalind and Wynne, and he was in the automotive field when he applied for a job at the fire department and found his true calling.

Chief Fields worked his way up the ladder and, in 1991, became the first African-American to serve as chief of the Albany Fire Department in Albany, GA.

During that time, Chief Fields also served in the role of emergency management director, and was confronted with two major floods that devastated the area in 1994 and 1998.

Chief Fields retired in 2000 after touching many lives through his fire safety efforts and through his church, Jordan Grove Missionary Baptist, where he served in many roles.

The Albany Fire Department headquarters appropriately lowered their flags to half-mast during the memorial service for Chief Fields.

Henry Fields was an inspirational leader and his years of service to his community will not be forgotten.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. NORMAN FRANCIS

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to honor Dr. Norman Francis, president of Xavier University of Louisiana and grand marshal for the 2015 Zulu Social Aid and Pleasure Club Coronation Ball.

Dr. Francis was born in Lafayette, LA, to the son of a barber and a stay-home mother who valued education and hard work. After Dr. Francis graduated from St. Paul High School in 1948, he was awarded a scholarship to Xavier University, America's only historically black Catholic university, where he excelled academically. In 1953, he enrolled in Loyola University New Orleans from which he earned his juris doctorate in 1955. After this, he spent 2 years in the U.S. Army before returning to New Orleans.

In 1968, Dr. Francis was named president of Xavier University. He was the first African American man to lead Xavier, and he is currently the longest-sitting university president in the United States. As both a student and eventual administrator, Dr. Francis has been at Xavier for more than five decades. He is credited with being the catalyst for nearly every new building constructed on the campus during the past four decades.

Under Dr. Francis' leadership, Xavier continues to rank first nationally in the number of African American students earning undergraduate degrees in the biology and the life sciences, chemistry, physics, and pharmacy. Since 1993, Xavier has also continued to rank first nationally for African American students being accepted into medical schools.

Dr. Francis has received numerous honorary degrees from other universities and prestigious awards in recognition of his leadership in higher education and for unselfish service to New Orleans and to our Nation. In 2006, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President George W. Bush. Dr. Francis served as chairman of the Louisiana Recovery Authority following the devastation from Hurricane Katrina and Rita, and he was a leader in the efforts to rebuild the lives of those affected by the storms. In the aftermath of these storms, one publication called Dr. Francis a "quiet hero." This is a great way to describe a man who has done so much for his university, his community, his State, and his Nation.

I am pleased to join with the Zulu Social Aid and Pleasure Club in honoring grand marshal Dr. Norman Francis.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 527. An act to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 527. An act to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 405. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-591. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Reductions for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committees on the Budget; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-592. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Preview Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committees on the Budget; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-593. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9920-98) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-594. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Flutriafol; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9922-06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-595. A communication from the Under Secretary for Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rural Development Regulations—Update to FmHA References and to Census References" (RIN0570-AA30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-596. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Russian Sanctions: Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine" (RIN0694-AG43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 3, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-597. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the Unverified List (UVL)" (RIN0694-AG35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-598. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to Norway; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-599. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions involving U.S. exports to the United Arab Emirates; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-600. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Housing Trust Fund" (RIN2506-AC30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-601. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense and Global Security), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to assistance provided by the Department of Defense (DoD) for sporting events during calendar year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-602. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress On Repair of Naval Vessels in Foreign Shipyards"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-603. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts" ((RIN1904-AB99) (Docket No. EERE-2009-BT-TP-0016)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-604. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-120); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-605. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Annual Funding Notice for Defined Benefit Plans" (RIN1210-AB18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 3, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-606. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Mother and Infant Home Visiting Program Evaluation: Early Findings on the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-607. A communication from the Director, Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Annual Sunshine Act Report for 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-608. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2014 through September 30, 2014 and the Management Response for the period ending September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-609. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-610. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Bureau of Prisons' compliance with the privatization requirements of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-611. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Competition, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds

for Section 8 of the Clayton Act" (FR Doc. 2015-00929) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-612. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Competition, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 7a of the Clayton Act" (FR Doc. 2015-00933) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-613. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; First Quarter of Fiscal Year 2015"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-614. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Washington; Redesignation to Attainment for the Tacoma-Pierce County Nonattainment Area and Approval of Associated Maintenance Plan for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9922-81-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-615. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Transportation Conformity and Conformity of General Federal Actions" (FRL No. 9922-73-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-616. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Inspection and Maintenance Program Updates" (FRL No. 9922-42-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-617. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision to the Arizona State Implementation Plan; Nogales Nonattainment Area; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventories" (FRL No. 9922-74-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-618. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL No. 9921-37-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-619. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the Clean Air Act Section 110 Submission Requirements for State

Implementation Plans and Notice of Availability of an Option for Electronic Reporting" ((RIN2060-AS20) (FRL No. 9922-54-Region OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-620. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of the Reformulated Gasoline Program to Maine's Southern Counties" ((RIN2060-AS19) (FRL No. 9921-82-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-621. A communication from the Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the National Transportation Safety Board's 2015 Most Wanted List; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-622. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Federal Railroad Administrator, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-623. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions No. 24 through No. 44" (RIN0648-XD547) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-624. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XD713) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-625. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2015 Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pollock, Atka Mackerel, and Pacific Code Total Allowable Catch Amounts" (RIN0648-XD688) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-626. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Vessel Monitoring Systems; Requirements for Enhanced Mobile Transceiver Unit and Mobile Communication Service Type-Approval" (RIN0648-BD002) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-627. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United

States; Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act Provisions; American Lobster Fishery" (RIN0648-BD45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-628. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0924)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-629. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0927)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-630. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0925)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-631. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2009-0108)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-632. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0580)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-633. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0587)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-634. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0770)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-635. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0692)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-636. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (36); Amdt. No. 3623" ((RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-637. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" ((RIN0648-XD654) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 295. A bill to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 337. A bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 410. A bill to strengthen Indian education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 411. A bill to authorize the approval of natural gas pipelines and establish deadlines and expedite permits for certain natural gas gathering lines on Federal land and Indian land; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 412. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to encourage and support parent, family, and community involvement in schools, to provide needed integrated services and comprehensive supports to children for the ultimate goal of assisting students to stay in school, become successful learners, improve their academic achievement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax deductions for corporate regulatory violations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 414. A bill to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable energy in the California Desert Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 415. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in order to limit the penalties to a State that does not meet its maintenance of effort level of funding to a one-time penalty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 416. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to promote the education of expectant and parenting students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 417. A bill to encourage spectrum licenses to make unused spectrum available for use by rural and smaller carriers in order to expand wireless coverage; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 418. A bill to support and encourage the health and well-being of elementary school and secondary school students by enhancing school physical education and health education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 419. A bill to assist coordination among science, technology, engineering, and mathematics efforts in the States, to strengthen the capacity of elementary schools, middle schools, and secondary schools to prepare students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUNT,

Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BURR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. COATS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S.J. Res. 9. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires (except during time of war and subject to suspension by Congress) that the total amount of money expended by the United States during any fiscal year not exceed the amount of certain revenue received by the United States during such fiscal year and not exceed 20 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States during the previous calendar year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 85

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 85, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a simplified income-driven repayment plan, and for other purposes.

S. 111

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 111, a bill to prohibit a Federal agency from establishing or implementing a policy that discourages or prohibits the selection of a resort or vacation destination as the location for a conference or event, and for other purposes.

S. 113

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 113, a bill to ensure that Federal Register notices submitted to the Bureau of Land Management are reviewed in a timely manner.

S. 140

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 140, a bill to combat human trafficking.

S. 141

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 141, a bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 149, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.8 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 166, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older

Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 197

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 197, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes.

S. 223

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 223, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program on awarding grants for provision of furniture, household items, and other assistance to homeless veterans to facilitate their transition into permanent housing, and for other purposes.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 235, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 265

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 265, a bill to expand opportunity through greater choice in education, and for other purposes.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 269, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from modifying the standard for determining whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of

the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to prohibit earmarks.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 327

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 327, a bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

S. 337

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 337, a bill to improve the Freedom of Information Act.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 373

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 384

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to facilitate water leasing and water transfers to promote conservation and efficiency.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 386, a bill to limit the

authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 394

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 394, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the 15-year recovery period for qualified leasehold improvement property, qualified restaurant property, and qualified retail improvement property.

S. 402

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 402, a bill to establish a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Master Teacher Corps program.

S. 404

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 404, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. RES. 40

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 40, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding efforts by the United States and others to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

S. RES. 69

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 69, a resolution calling for the protection of religious minority rights and freedoms worldwide.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax deductions for corporate regulatory violations; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing, along with Senator GRASSLEY, the Government Settlement Transparency and Reform Act. This bill aims to end the subsidization of illegal corporate behavior by taxpayers by closing a loophole that allows corporations to reap tax benefits from payments made to the government stemming from settling corporate misdeeds.

Corporations accused of illegal activity routinely settle legal disputes with the government out of court because it allows both the company and the gov-

ernment to avoid the time, expense, and uncertainty of going to trial. Under Federal law, money paid to settle corporate civil or criminal penalties is not deductible. But under the tax code, offending companies may often write off any portion of a settlement that is not paid directly to the government as a penalty or fine for violation of the law. Corporations exploit this provision by later characterizing settlement penalties as restitution and a tax-deductible business expense.

I think most would agree that, for example, a corporation should not come to an agreement with the government to pay \$500 million in criminal or civil fines and then when they file their taxes count those very fines as a business expense and take a tax windfall. Corporations that do this are effectively using taxpayer dollars to subsidize their illegal behavior. In 2005, the Government Accountability Office found that of the 34 companies and \$1 billion in settlements they examined, 20 companies took a tax deduction for some or all of the money it paid to the government. Those settlements were silent on whether that \$1 billion to the government counted as penalties or restitution. According to GAO, in two of those settlements, company representatives said they made a mistake in deducting civil penalty payments totaling \$1.9 million and said they would amend their tax returns.

To address these practices, the Reed-Grassley bill would amend 162(f) of the tax code and require the government and the settling party to reach pre-filing agreements on how the settlement payments should be treated for tax purposes. Our bill also clarifies the rules about what settlement payments are punitive and therefore non-deductible. Furthermore, it increases transparency by requiring the government to file a return at the time of settlement to accurately reflect the tax treatment of the amounts that will be paid by the offending party.

Last Congress it was estimated that over a ten-year budget window this legislation would raise \$218 million in revenue.

With this legislation we can close this tax loophole that flies in the face of sensible and fair tax policy. The tax code should not be used to subsidize illegal activity by corporations. Indeed, when a fine is levied, that fine should not be construed as a legitimate business expense. Instead, it should be paid in full, with no tax deduction taken.

I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY for working with me again on this legislation. He has long championed closing this loophole. I urge our colleagues to join us by cosponsoring this legislation and seeking its passage.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 414. A bill to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable en-

ergy in the California Desert Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the California Desert Conservation and Recreation Act, a piece of legislation that serves as an update to the historic California Desert Protection Act of 1994.

This bill reflects our attempt to achieve consensus among the various uses of desert land and the many stakeholders involved. This bill is bipartisan and it charts a commonsense path forward for the California desert.

It protects additional desert land. It helps manage my State's natural resources. It balances competing interests. It includes provisions on recreation and renewable energy development.

Overall, it ensures that the California desert will remain what it is today: a true American treasure.

This bill has been a long time in the making.

Only three months after I was sworn in as Senator, in January 1993, I introduced the Desert Protection Act. I picked up where my predecessors left off, and President Clinton signed the bill into law in October 1994.

This law was the largest land conservation designation in the continental United States:

It protected or increased existing protection for 9.6 million acres of desert land.

It established the iconic national parks of Joshua Tree and Death Valley, as well as the Mojave National Preserve.

It helped save habitats for endangered species.

It continues to attract millions of tourists to southern California—a boon for the economy.

It has ensured that the beautiful landscapes will be enjoyed for generations.

I recently visited the desert to celebrate the 20-year anniversary of that legislation becoming law. I was once again reminded how stunning the special land is. Simply put, it is an icon of the American West.

I became even more convinced: now is the time to do even more.

This is why I am introducing new legislation—to build upon the legacy of 1994.

The bill I am introducing today has a simple goal: to help manage California's desert resources with a well-planned approach that balances conservation, recreation, energy production and other needs.

This bill is first and foremost a bipartisan bill. It brings so many groups together:

Environmental groups; State and local governments; the off-road community; cattle ranchers; mining interests; the Defense Department; energy companies; California's public utility companies; and many others.

To account for all the uses of the desert, this whole effort was based on

an attempt to find consensus. We have worked very hard over the years to build that consensus.

We have consulted these stakeholders over the past 6 years. We have had thousands of hours of discussions. They have provided invaluable input and I am grateful for all of them coming to the table.

The cornerstone of the legislation is the creation of two new national monuments:

First is the Mojave Trails National Monument, which would encompass 965,000 acres. Of that, 196,000 acres is Caetellus lands, the areas acquired or donated to the Federal Government between 1999 and 2004 with the purpose of conserving land for the American public.

It should be noted that this donated land, which stretches from the Mexican border to San Bernardino county, was the largest land donation to the U.S. Government in the continental United States. But recently, the aim to conserve it was threatened by the development of some solar energy projects. That is why this bill is necessary: to ensure that the intention of those generous donors, to protect this land in perpetuity, is actually realized.

The second monument designation is the Sand to Snow National Monument. This would be made up of 135,000 acres of land from the desert floor in the Coachella Valley to the top of Mount San Geronio.

The Mojave Trails National Monument is essential as it contains important wildlife corridors and habitats. The Sand to Snow National Monument, likewise, would be one of the most environmentally diverse monuments in the country, including habitat for 240 species of migrating and breeding birds.

The bill has many other conservation provisions including: designating six BLM wilderness areas, covering 250,000 acres of land, designating 77 miles along 4 waterways as Wild and Scenic River; adding land to the Death Valley National Park, 39,000 acres, Mojave National Preserve, 22,000 acres, and Joshua Tree National Park, 4,500 acres.

Conserving pristine desert land such as this is most definitely in the interests of our country. The California desert is a very special place and it deserves to stay that way.

The bill also designates five existing BLM Off-Highway Vehicle Areas, covering approximately 142,000 acres of desert, as permanent Off-Highway Vehicle, OHV, recreation areas.

As has been stated, the desert has many uses, and motorists have long used the area for recreation. These provisions give off-highway enthusiasts the certainty they need. Their use of the desert will be protected as much as conservation areas are.

In fact, in this regard we have had success in recent years. Congressman PAUL COOK and I brokered an agreement for the mixed use of Johnson Valley, which was the subject of debate be-

tween the Marine Corps and off-road vehicle enthusiasts. We brought the parties together and reached a compromise. We made clear what land was for off-roading, what land was for Marine Corps training only and what land was to be shared.

This model of compromise should be instructive. When the parties come together, as they have in the case of this bill, we can achieve an equitable and fair distribution of the land.

Another use of the desert land that we must take into account is renewable energy.

Let me be clear: developing cleaner energy is important for California's economy and for our efforts to fight global warming.

But I also feel strongly that we must be very careful where these facilities are located.

Balancing conservation, development and other uses is possible, we just need to come up with the right solutions. Thankfully, some of these compromises are already in place.

In April 2009 there were 28 solar and wind energy proposals on lands proposed to be included in the Mojave Trails National Monument, including sites on former Catellus lands intended for permanent conservation.

I visited some of those sites at the time, including one particularly beautiful area known as the Broadwell Valley, where thousands of acres of pristine lands were proposed for development. Seeing it first hand, I quickly came to the conclusion that those lands were simply not the right place for renewable energy development.

Since then, 26 of the 28 applications have been withdrawn. So what happened in the nearly 6 years since then?

First, the Energy and Interior Departments developed new solar energy zones. These zones allow projects to be developed on lands least likely to harm plant and wildlife species, and allow projects to be completed faster and with fewer conflicts. This is a smart compromise.

Second, California has worked closely with Federal agencies to develop the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan. This blueprint will help identify pristine lands that warrant protection and direct energy projects elsewhere.

Today, none of the land proposed for renewable development or transmission as part of these initiatives conflicts with the conservation proposed in this bill.

This is a fair balancing of priorities, and I think it provides a clear path forward.

The bill I am introducing also takes additional action to help promote responsible renewable energy development.

Specifically, the bill requires the Interior Department to exchange approximately 370,000 acres of small, isolated parcels of State land for Federal land. By swapping state land that is often surrounded by wilderness and national parks for other federal land,

these exchanges will provide California with sites for renewable energy production, recreation or other uses.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take a good look at this legislation. I hope they understand that the many stakeholders involved have made their voices heard. The text of this legislation represents a consensus effort.

Most importantly, I hope they recognize the simple fact that desert conservation has never been a partisan issue.

Over the years, legislators have come together across party lines to preserve this great piece of land.

Given our past success, I am hopeful this Congress will take this legislation up and move it forward. It is the right thing to do, and the California desert needs it.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BURR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. COATS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HELLER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S.J. Res. 8. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, recently the Senate has had a lot of discussion about partisan overreach. We have talked about an administration that seems to view democracy as what it can get away with, not what it can work cooperatively to achieve. It is worrying for our country, and we keep seeing more examples of it.

Consider the administration's effort to weaken workers' rights. This administration's appointees on the National Labor Relations Board released their so-called ambush rule back in December. It is designed with one purpose in mind: to fatten the wallets of powerful political bosses by weakening the rights of middle-class workers.

Republicans believe a worker has a right to make her own informed choices about joining a union. We don't think powerful political bosses should attempt to make that decision for her, but that is just what this rule aims to achieve. These bosses think they can enrich their own coffers if they can deny workers real opportunities to

weigh the pros and cons of joining a union. For instance, in an era of stagnant wages, does a worker want to see her paycheck shrink so a political boss can attend more campaign fundraisers? Republicans think that is a choice for the worker to make. Does a worker want to give up her right to demand better pay or a promotion that she deserves and cede those decisions to a distant political organization?

Republicans think she has a right to make those choices for herself and she has a right to make them in an informed way, but the administration's ambush rule would dramatically weaken her ability to do so. In many cases it wouldn't even allow her more than a handful of days to weigh the pros and cons of such a costly and important decision. It is really not fair. And it is not just me saying that; consider the words of John F. Kennedy. Here is what he had to say about it. "There should be at least a 30-day interval" for union elections, he said. He noted that these 30 days represent a safeguard against "rushing employees into an election where they are unfamiliar with the issues." Kennedy was right.

There is another important issue at stake here too. Just as Republicans think a worker has a right to make her own informed choices, Republicans also think her personal information is none of the business of powerful political bosses. But the administration's ambush rule would allow those bosses to access things such as her email address and cell number without—without—her permission. It also would allow those bosses to track her, to know exactly when and where she is working—again, without her permission. She can't opt out and she can't unsubscribe. This is really chilling. This is really extreme.

What about the men and women who rise early every day to fulfill their dreams, the men and women who provide so many opportunities for others to fulfill theirs? This ambush rule is also aimed at preventing someone with a small business of her own from even having a real conversation with her employees about the cost and the benefits of joining a union. The ambush rule would give extraordinary power to political bosses on the outside, while shutting her voice down—the one person who probably knows more about and cares more about her employees than anyone else. After years spent building a dream and caring about the men and women who helped her get there, this rule is an insult—an insult—to entrepreneurs like her.

Moreover, it is not the men and women on the assembly line who are demanding the ambush rule. There is no demand for this coming up with the workforce in America. So who is demanding it? It is the powerful political bosses who worry that more and more workers are making an informed choice not to join a union. Those bosses are worried about what informed choices could mean for them—less money, less power.

So this far-reaching rule—the so-called Mt. Everest of regulations—is not the result of the administration seeking out the best policy; it is just another example of the administration seeing what it can get away with. It is a brazen attempt to enrich powerful political friends of the White House by weakening workers' rights. It is not fair for workers, and it is not right for our country.

My good friends the Senators from Tennessee and Wyoming are here on the floor to explain what Congress plans to do to stand up for basic fairness in the workplace. They are going to talk about this latest example of partisan executive overreach—the kind of overreach that is coming to define the Obama administration—and what Congress plans to do next.

Madam President, I see the Senator from Tennessee is on his feet, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the recognition and the majority leader for his remarks and his leadership. I am also glad to be here with the Senator from Wyoming, who over the years has been the leading Republican Senator on the issue of ambush elections.

We are here today, as the majority leader said, to introduce a Congressional Review Act resolution to stop a new National Labor Relations Board rule. I would like to speak about that for a few minutes and then let the Senator from Wyoming continue.

Last December the NLRB issued a final rule that shortened the timeline between when pro-union organizers ask an employer for a secret ballot election and when the election actually takes place. I refer to this as an ambush election because it forces a union election before an employer has a chance to figure out what is going on. Even worse, it jeopardizes employees' privacy by requiring employers to turn over personal employee information—including email addresses, phone numbers, shift hours, and locations—to union organizers.

The effect of this resolution will be to permit the majority leader to bring this resolution to the floor after the congressional recess. There will be 10 hours of debate. The resolution cannot be amended, and it needs a majority vote to pass. The House of Representatives is following a similar procedure. Both Houses must vote on it. If it passes both Houses, the President can sign or veto the resolution. If the President decides to veto, it would take 67 votes to override. If the NLRB's new ambush election rule is disapproved, the Board cannot issue a substantially similar rule without congressional approval.

Today, more than 95 percent of union elections occur within 56 days after a petition is filed, but under this new rule elections could take place in as few as 11 days after a petition is filed.

This rule will harm employers and employees alike, and here is how.

If you are an employer who gets ambushed—in other words, a union election happens before you really know what is going on—on day 1 you get a faxed copy of an election petition that has been filed at your local NLRB regional office stating that 30 percent of your employees support a union. The union may have already been quietly trying to organize for months without your knowledge. Your employees have been able to hear only the union's pitch.

By day 2 or 3 of this process, you must publicly post an election notice in your workplace and post it online as well if you communicate with your employees electronically.

By noon on day 7, you must file with the NLRB what is called a statement of position. This is a comprehensive, written legal document in which an employer sets out legal positions and claims. Under this new NLRB rule, you, the employer, waive your rights to use any legal arguments not raised in the document. On day 7, you must also present the union and the NLRB with a list of prospective voters as well as their job classifications, shift hours, and work locations.

On day 8, a pre-election hearing is held at the NLRB regional office, and an election date is set.

By day 10, the employer must present the union with a list of employee names, personal email addresses, personal cell phone numbers, and home addresses.

Day 11 is the earliest day on which the NLRB could conduct the election under the new rule. The union has the power to postpone an election by an additional 10 days at this point, but the employer has no corresponding power.

Under this new NLRB rule, before the hearing on day 8 an employer will have less than 1 week to figure out what an election petition is, find legal representation—many employers don't have a labor lawyer as a matter of course—determine legal positions on the relevant issues, learn what statements and actions the law permits and prohibits, gather information required by the NLRB, communicate with employees about the decision they are making, and correct any misstatements and falsehoods employees may be hearing from union organizers. Making even the slightest mistake in the lead-up to an election can result in the NLRB setting aside the results and ordering a rerun election or, worse, the Board could require an employer to automatically bargain with the union.

But it is the employees who stand to lose the most under this new rule. First, because of this ambush election, employees may only hear half the story about what unionizing may mean for them and for their workplace. When a workplace is unionized—especially in a State that does not have a right-to-work law—employees have their dues money taken out of every paycheck,

whether they like it or not. Employees lose the ability to deal directly with their employer to address concerns, or ask for a promotion or raise, and instead have to work through the union.

Important considerations, such as which of their fellow employees will be included in the bargaining unit, will no longer be determined before the election. As the two dissenting members of the NLRB put it: Employees will be asked to “vote now, understand later.”

Second, employees lose their privacy because the final rule we seek to overturn requires employers to hand over employees’ personal email addresses, cell phone numbers, shift locations, and job classifications, even if the employee has made it clear he does not want to be contacted by union organizers.

This rule appears to be a solution in search of a problem. Only 4.3 percent of union elections occur more than 56 days after the petition is filed. The current median number of days between when the petition is filed and the election is held is just 38 days.

These figures are well within the NLRB’s own goals for timely elections. Unions won 64 percent of elections in 2013. In recent years, the union win rate has actually been going up. So what is the problem?

The majority leader said it very well when he referred to a 1959 debate over amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. Then-Senator John F. Kennedy warned against rushing employees into a union election. Senator Kennedy said:

There should be at least a 30-day interval between the request for an election and the holding of the election...in which both parties can present their viewpoints.

The 30-day waiting period is an additional safeguard against rushing employees into an election where they are unfamiliar with the issues.

It is clear to see this rule is wrong. That is why Senator ENZI, Senator MCCONNELL, and I are asking the Senate to disapprove the rule and prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from issuing any substantially similar rule.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, for his comments.

I don’t think I have ever heard it put quite as concisely or the timeline explained quite as well as he did. I hope people are paying attention. I hope people take a look at the journal and see exactly how short a timeframe that is for both the employer and the employees.

So I rise to support the resolution of disapproval that would repeal the National Labor Relations Board’s ambush election rule.

I again thank my friend Senator ALEXANDER for his leadership as the chairman of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee and for leading this effort to prevent yet more misguided Federal regulation that will hurt American businesses and employees.

Unfortunately this isn’t the first time we have had to fight this rule from the NLRB. When I led the Congressional Review Act resolution to stop this rule in 2012, I truly appreciated Senator ALEXANDER’s support and am proud to support him now. I didn’t have the votes to pass the resolution in 2012, but we have had some elections and some changes in the Senate since then.

The rule the National Labor Relations Board has proposed would be a tremendous burden on employers, especially small businesses. If this rule goes into effect, it will mean employers will barely have time to meet their preelection legal obligations. It will mean employees will be rushed into an election without time to study and consider what the unionization would mean for them, for their workplace, and for their community. Also, Big Labor will be able to force elections through in order to boost revenue from union dues and increase the influence of Big Labor.

Our economy is already grappling with Federal rules and regulations that hold back businesses. This rule from the National Labor Relations Board will be yet another break, slowing down our economy at a time when we need to encourage employers and businesses to grow. It would be especially harmful to small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy and the most important factor in maintaining our fragile economic growth.

Small businesses that don’t have human resource departments and more particularly don’t have in-house legal counsel already face a significant burden when they have to navigate union elections. This rule would only make it harder. This rule would hurt businesses for the sole purpose of helping unions that don’t need it.

Union elections are supposed to be held in a timely and fair manner, which is what the current system achieves. The average time between filing an election petition, as has been mentioned, and holding the vote is 38 days, and nearly all elections happen within 2 months.

That process allows employers to understand their rights and meet their legal obligations. It allows employees to educate themselves about what unionization means for them personally and for their work, and it ensures that union elections will be a fair opportunity for workers to decide whether to organize.

Under the current system there is a 25-day waiting period between the setting of an election and the actual secret ballot election. That window of time is crucial. Employers use that

time to understand their rights and restrictions in the process and to meet their legal obligations.

The union election process is not simple, nor is it straightforward for employees. There are numerous places where a well-meaning employer working to meet their obligations could misstep and face heavy penalties from the National Labor Relations Board.

Employers also use this time to communicate with their employees about the decision they are making and to clear up misstatements, rumors or falsehoods that have been going around.

The time between petitioning for election and voting is also used for parties to study decisions by hearing officers or the National Labor Relations Board’s regional director and ask for clarification or review.

Under the National Labor Relations Board’s rule, all the opportunities for anyone involved with the process to understand their legal obligations, to exercise their rights, to study or debate the arguments for or against unionization or even to learn about the issue would be squeezed into as little as 14 days.

Is it fair for an employee to only have 10 days to learn how his or her vote will affect the rest of their time with that employer—we have to remember they are going to be working during that time probably—or how much money membership in a union is going to cost them or what it means for their ability to negotiate directly with their employer for raises or other benefits or concerns or any of the countless other issues an employee might want to approach his or her employer about?

Under current law, both parties are able to raise issues about the election at a preelection hearing, covering such issues as which employees should be included in the bargaining unit and whether particular employees are actually supervisors.

Under the new regulation, parties will be barred from raising these questions until after the election. Employees will be forced to vote without knowing which other employees will actually be in the bargaining unit with them. This is important information that weighs heavily in most employees’ votes.

Under current law, when either party raises preelection issues, they are allowed to submit evidence and testimony, and file post-hearing briefs for the hearing officer to consider, and then they have 14 days in which to appeal decisions made with respect to that election.

Under the new regulation, the hearing officer is given the broad discretion to bar all evidence and testimony unrelated to the question of representation and all post-election briefs and no appeals or requests for stays are allowed. This could be quite a disadvantage for employees as well as employers.

What this all adds up to is an extremely small window of time for filing

the petition to the actual election, little opportunity for employers to learn their rights or communicate with their employees their rights, and less opportunities for employees to research the union and the ramifications of forming the union.

The NLRB is ensuring that the odds are stacked against the employees and the businesses. This vote is an opportunity to tell the National Labor Relations Board to reverse course.

I hope this resolution will convince the National Labor Relations Board to pull back from this disastrous rule and encourage them to focus on their statutory mission rather than overturning decades of settled practice that ensures that this process is held in a timely manner and that there is a fair opportunity for all sides to understand, to participate, and to exercise their rights.

The NLRB's purpose is to enforce the National Labor Relations Act, which is a carefully balanced law that has only rarely been changed. When changes have occurred, they have been the result of careful negotiations, with input from stakeholders and thoughtful debate.

The NLRB is attempting a sneak attack through the rulemaking process. This is an ambush on the National Labor Relations Act to set up ambush elections.

The National Labor Relations Board is an agency that has historically issued very few regulations. Most of the questions that come up under the law are handled through the decisions of the Board. Board decisions often do change the enforcement of the law significantly, but they are issued in response to an actual dispute and a question of law.

In contrast, the ambush election is not a response to a real problem because the current election process for certifying whether employees want to form a union is not broken. The rule was not carefully negotiated by stakeholders, it was not made with careful debate, and there was no attempt to reach a consensus.

In the late 1950s Congress worked to pass the Landrieu-Griffin Act, which protected the rights of both rank-and-file union members and their employees. This was a carefully constructed piece of legislation that came out of a special committee to study the issue, that heard from more than 1,500 witnesses over 3 years. And Congress debated the issue of how long a period of

time there should be between the request for an election and the actual election coming up during those negotiations.

My colleagues may be surprised to learn—although they wouldn't if they were listening to the previous two speeches—that it was Senator John F. Kennedy who argued vigorously for a 30-day waiting period prior to the election. He said:

There should be at least a 30 day interval between a request for an election and the holding of an election . . . in which both parties can present their viewpoints. . . . The 30 day waiting period is an additional safeguard against rushing employees into an election where they are unfamiliar with the issues.

Again, that was a quote by Senator John F. Kennedy, speaking directly to the need for fairness to employees. The 30-day waiting period provision he supported did not ultimately become part of the law, and obviously it is not a law today. Instead, the NLRB adopted the practice of a 25-day waiting period in almost every case.

This caution about the need for employees to have a chance to become familiar with the issues is just as true today. Employees who are not aware of the organizing activity at their worksites and even those who are need to have an opportunity to learn about the union they may join. They will want to research the union to ensure it has no signs of corruption. They will want to know how other worksites have fared with this union and whether they can believe the promises the union organizers may be extending. Employees should have every chance to understand the impact of unionization. Four decades ago Senators recognized that employees deserved the opportunity to gather this and all other relevant information before casting their votes. Unfortunately, the NLRB is choosing to ignore this caution, and rank-and-file employees will suffer.

This situation is exactly what the Congressional Review Act was intended for. When an agency goes too far and tries to impose rules and regulations that are unnecessary or harmful—in this case, both—the Congressional Review Act gives Congress an expedited process for repealing that regulation. It is a process that cannot be held up and cannot be stalled or put off to ensure that Congress can act when it needs to stop an out-of-control agency.

By any measure, the current law and certification system for union elections ensures that the process is fair for all parties and that all parties have

the opportunity to exercise their rights and to fully understand the implications. The National Labor Relations Board has not made the case that elections are being held up or stalled. They cannot make the case because the data doesn't support it. I want to repeat. The National Labor Relations Board has not made the case that elections are being held up or stalled. They cannot make that case because the data doesn't support it. There is no need for this rule, which is just a handout to Big Labor, which relies on pushing unions forward before businesses and employees have a chance to study and understand the full effects.

This resolution will preserve the fairness and swift resolution of claims which occur under current law. It will not disadvantage unions or roll back any rights. It is important to say that again because there is going to be a lot of misinformation about what this resolution does. This resolution does not disadvantage unions or roll back any union rights. What it does is it ensures that small business employers and employees in America are not unfairly disadvantaged by a burdensome process and that employees are not misled with insufficient or incorrect information during the union election process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Under a successful Congressional Review Act disapproval, the agency in question is prohibited from issuing any substantially similar regulation. That means the National Labor Relations Board could not just reissue this regulation again and again, as they have currently done.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution to ensure that the National Labor Relations Board understands that this rule is a no-go and that we will stand up to ensure a fair process.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to make a unanimous consent request that Lt. Col. Anthony McCarty, a defense fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Debbie Stabenow:									
Senegal	franc		376.00						376.00
Tanzania	shilling		751.50						751.50
Ethiopia	birr		984.00						984.00
Italy	euro		1,093.57						1,093.57
Senator Amy Klobuchar:									
Senegal	franc		461.75						461.75
Tanzania	shilling		575.10						575.10
Ethiopia	birr		810.52						810.52
Italy	euro		878.58						878.58
Senator Heidi Heitkamp:									
Senegal	franc		238.95						238.95
Tanzania	shilling		484.90						484.90
Ethiopia	birr		1,026.50						1,026.50
Italy	euro		1,115.60						1,115.60
Christopher Adamo:									
Senegal	franc		476.00						476.00
Tanzania	shilling		851.50						851.50
Ethiopia	birr		1,084.00						1,084.00
Italy	euro		1,043.57						1,043.57
Anne Brewster-Stanski:									
Senegal	franc		376.00						376.00
Tanzania	shilling		751.50						751.50
Ethiopia	birr		955.00						955.00
Italy	euro		1,093.57						1,093.57
Jacqlyn Schneider:									
Senegal	franc		403.00						403.00
Tanzania	shilling		814.50						814.50
Ethiopia	birr		1,073.00						1,073.00
Italy	euro		1,101.57						1,101.57
Joseph Shultz:									
Senegal	franc		476.00						476.00
Tanzania	shilling		851.50						851.50
Ethiopia	birr		1,084.00						1,084.00
Italy	euro		943.57						943.57
Brigit Helgen:									
Senegal	franc		544.02						544.02
Tanzania	shilling		897.45						897.45
Ethiopia	birr		468.10						468.10
Italy	euro		897.04						897.04
Delegation Expenses:*									
Senegal	franc					2,862.55			2,862.55
Tanzania	shilling					18,861.79			18,861.79
Ethiopia	birr					25,938.60			25,938.60
Italy	euro					3,285.21			3,285.21
Total			24,981.86			50,948.15			75,930.01

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR DEBBIE STABENOW,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, Dec. 31, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Shannon Hines:									
France	Euro		1,664.00		270.00				1,934.00
Hungary	Forint		500.61		27.13				527.74
United States	Dollar				10,630.40				10,630.40
Tim Rieser:									
Cuba	Peso		506.00						506.00
United States	Dollar				1,127.00		20.00		1,147.00
Paul Grove:									
Dem. Rep. Congo	Franc		1,043.00						1,043.00
Kenya	Shilling		1,080.00		1,560.00				2,640.00
United States	Dollar				4,816.40				4,816.40
Adam Yezerski:									
Dem. Rep. Congo	Franc		1,093.00						1,093.00
Kenya	Shilling		1,130.00		1,560.00				2,690.00
United States	Dollar				4,816.40				4,816.40
Delegation Expenses:*									
Kenya	Shilling				1,213.50		51.32		1,264.82
Total			7,016.61		26,020.83		71.32		33,108.76

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Jan. 23, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mike Kuiken:									
United States	Dollar				13,046.00				13,046.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		736.09						736.09
Afghanistan	Afghani		20.50						20.50

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mike Nobile:									
United States	Dollar		4.00		13,140.00				13,144.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		163.00				410.00		573.00
Adam Barker:									
United States	Dollar				13,046.00				13,046.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		445.83						445.83
Afghanistan	Afghani		20.50						20.50
Tom Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				13,046.00				13,046.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		445.83						445.83
Afghanistan	Afghani		20.50						20.50
Delegation Expenses: *									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham				211.23				211.23
Senator Tim Kaine:									
United States	Dollar				13,050.77				13,050.77
India	Rupee		1,184.85						1,184.85
Afghanistan	Afghani		69.00						69.00
Pakistan	Rupee		104.00						104.00
Qatar	Riyal		164.00						164.00
Karen Courington:									
United States	Dollar				12,970.40				12,970.40
India	Rupee		1,253.42						1,253.42
Afghanistan	Afghani		69.00						69.00
Pakistan	Rupee		224.00						224.00
Qatar	Riyal		164.00						164.00
Senator Angus King:									
United States	Dollar				14,604.72				14,604.72
India	Rupee		876.95				72.20		949.15
Afghanistan	Afghani		69.00						69.00
Pakistan	Rupee		94.00				10.00		104.00
Qatar	Riyal		164.00						164.00
Stephen Smith:									
United States	Dollar				14,604.72				14,604.72
India	Rupee		876.95		50.44		96.58		1,023.97
Afghanistan	Afghani		69.00						69.00
Pakistan	Rupee		94.00				10.00		104.00
Qatar	Riyal		164.00						164.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
India	Rupee						561.73		561.73
Pakistan	Rupee						132.45		132.45
Qatar	Riyal						59.31		59.31
Senator James Inhofe:									
United States	Dollar				11,644.80				11,644.80
Ukraine	Hryvnia		421.01						421.01
Jordan	Dinar		191.00						191.00
Germany	Euro		391.09						391.09
Tom Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				11,644.80				11,644.80
Ukraine	Hryvnia		421.01						421.01
Jordan	Dinar		191.00						191.00
Germany	Euro		391.09						391.09
Delegation Expenses: *									
Ukraine	Hryvnia						200.44		200.44
Jordan	Dinar				196.08		362.58		558.66
Germany	Euro						1,619.01		1,619.01
Lithuania	Euro						356.91		356.91
Senator John McCain:									
Canada	Dollar		611.42						611.42
Christian Brose:									
Canada	Dollar		675.57						675.57
Elizabeth O'Bagy:									
Canada	Dollar		649.77						649.77
Senator Ted Cruz:									
Canada	Dollar		604.41						604.41
Victoria Coates:									
Canada	Dollar		677.57						677.57
Senator Tim Kaine:									
Canada	Dollar		587.17						587.17
Karen Courington:									
Canada	Dollar		600.01						600.01
Mary Naylor:									
Canada	Dollar		590.76						590.76
Delegation Expenses: *									
Canada	Dollar				371.87		9,185.61		9,557.48
Jonathan Epstein:									
United States	Dollar				8,098.00				8,098.00
Turkey	Lira		200.00						200.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Turkey	Lira						8.51		8.51
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				16,336.52				16,336.52
Turkey	Lira		129.00						129.00
Elizabeth O'Bagy:									
United States	Dollar				14,333.43				14,333.43
Afghanistan	Afghani		112.00						112.00
Iraq	Dinar		61.00						61.00
Turkey	Lira		140.10						140.10
Delegation Expenses: *									
Afghanistan	Afghani		156.00						156.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						286.90		286.90
Iraq	Dinar				33,000.00				33,000.00
Turkey	Lira						20,596.00		20,596.00
Total			15,297.50		203,395.78		33,968.23		252,661.51

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Jan. 30, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Elizabeth Warren:									
Israel	Shekel		2,695.19						2,695.19
Jordan	Dinar		368.86						368.86
United States	Dollar				8,964.52				8,964.52
Jonathan Donenberg:									
Israel	Shekel		2,664.89						2,664.89
Jordan	Dinar		357.90						357.90
United States	Dollar				7,504.02				7,504.02
Total			6,086.84		16,468.54				22,555.38

SENATOR TIM JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
Dec. 18, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kusai Merchant:									
Peru	Sole		754.00				3,041.50		3,795.50
United States	Dollar				1,000.93				1,000.93
Total			754.00		1,000.93		3,041.50		4,796.43

SENATOR PATTY MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Dec. 31, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ellen Doneski:									
United States	Dollar				19,109.90				19,109.90
South Korea	Won		2,308.88						2,308.88
John Branscome:									
United States	Dollar				19,112.90				19,112.90
South Korea	Won		2,442.88						2,442.88
Total			4,751.76		38,222.80				42,974.56

SENATOR JOHN THUNE,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation,
Jan. 29, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Lisa Murkowski:									
United States	Dollar				3,638.90				3,638.90
Iceland	Krona		589.17						589.17
Isaac Edwards:									
United States	Dollar				2,182.00				2,182.00
Iceland	Krona		855.55						855.55
Delegation Expenses:									
Iceland	Krona						651.57		651.57
Total			1,444.72		5,820.90		651.57		7,917.19

SENATOR MARY L. LANDRIEU,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Dec. 17, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joseph Mendelson:									
United States	Dollar				3,550.34				3,550.34
Peru	Nuevo Sol		3,448.00						3,448.00
Emily Enderle:									
United States	Dollar				1,105.84				1,105.84
Peru	Nuevo Sol		3,086.00						3,086.00
Total			6,534.00		4,656.18				11,190.18

SENATOR JAMES M. INHOFE,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, Jan. 23, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jayne White:									
Australia	Dollar		2,412.29						2,412.29
United States	Dollar				17,822.80				17,822.80
Elissa Allen:									
Australia	Dollar		2,961.84						2,961.84
United States	Dollar				17,822.80				17,822.80
Everett Eissenstat:									
Australia	Dollar		2,856.91						2,856.91
United States	Dollar				17,822.80				17,822.80
Shane Warren:									
Australia	Dollar		2,917.70						2,917.70
United States	Dollar				17,822.80				17,822.80
Delegation Expenses: *									
United States	Dollar						1,057.00		1,057.00
Tyler Brace:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,802.21						1,802.21
United States	Dollar				8,762.70				8,762.70
Delegation Expenses: *									
United States	Dollar						365.70		365.70
Jason Park:									
China	Renminbi		1,162.22						1,162.22
United States	Dollar				20,238.30				20,238.30
Shane Warren:									
China	Renminbi		1,165.97						1,165.97
United States	Dollar				20,238.30				20,238.30
Delegation Expenses: *									
United States	Dollar						1,240.47		1,240.47
Senator Pat Roberts:									
Kuwait	Dinar		297.28						297.28
United States	Dollar				22,480.90				22,480.90
Theda Khrestin:									
Kuwait	Dinar		346.28						346.28
United States	Dollar				22,480.90				22,480.90
Delegation Expenses: *									
Iraq	Dinar						22,917.70		22,917.70
Total			15,922.70		165,492.30		25,580.87		206,995.87

* Delegation expenses include transportation, embassy overtime and other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

SENATOR RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Jan. 13, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Canada	Dollar		594.99						594.99
Delegation Expenses: *									
Canada	Dollar						804.16		804.16
Senator John Barrasso:									
Qatar	Riyal		231.00						231.00
United States	Dollar				10,361.10				10,361.10
Charles Ziegler:									
Qatar	Riyal		231.00						231.00
United States	Dollar				9,966.00				9,966.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Qatar	Riyal						283.27		283.27
Senator Christopher Coons:									
Liberia	Dollar		682.50						682.50
United States	Dollar				10,287.80				10,287.80
Vali Sanmugalingan:									
Liberia	Dollar		700.50						700.50
United States	Dollar				10,287.80				10,287.80
Delegation Expenses: *									
Liberia	Dollar						2,500.73		2,500.73
Senator Jeff Flake:									
Cuba	Dollar		849.00						849.00
United States	Dollar				1,094.20				1,094.20
Chandler Morse:									
Cuba	Dollar		849.00						849.00
United States	Dollar				923.20				923.20
Senator Tom Udall:									
Cuba	Dollar		849.00						849.00
United States	Dollar				918.20				918.20
Matthew Padilla:									
Cuba	Dollar		849.00						849.00
United States	Dollar				918.20				918.20
Senator Christopher Murphy:									
Serbia	Euro		823.00						823.00
Montenegro	Euro		335.00						335.00
Kosovo	Euro		195.00						195.00
Albania	Lek		364.00						364.00
Croatia	Kuna		282.00						282.00
United States	Dollar				10,640.10				10,640.10
Jessica Elledge:									
Serbia	Euro		823.00						823.00
Montenegro	Euro		335.00						335.00
Kosovo	Euro		195.00						195.00
Albania	Lek		364.00						364.00
Croatia	Kuna		282.00						282.00
United States	Dollar				11,917.50				11,917.50
Delegation Expenses: *									
Serbia	Euro						1,416.00		1,416.00
Montenegro	Euro						1,130.00		1,130.00
Kosovo	Euro						1,329.57		1,329.57
Albania	Lek						1,711.00		1,711.00
Croatia	Kuna						826.00		826.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Sergio Aguirre:									
India	Rupee		1,253.42						1,253.42
Afghanistan	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Pakistan	Rupee		104.00						104.00
Qatar	Riyal		5.55						5.55
United States	Dollar				12,970.40				12,970.40
Delegation Expenses: *									
India	Rupee						374.48		374.48
Pakistan	Rupee						88.30		88.30
Qatar	Riyal						39.54		39.54
Viviana Bovo:									
Colombia	Peso		345.81						345.81
United States	Dollar				3,871.00				3,871.00
Ana Unruh Cohen:									
Peru	Nuevo Sol		2,852.00						2,852.00
United States	Dollar				2,729.94				2,729.94
Hal Connolly:									
Peru	Nuevo Sol		2,180.00						2,180.00
United States	Dollar				2,719.94				2,719.94
Jesse Young:									
Peru	Nuevo Sol		2,844.00						2,844.00
United States	Dollar				1,035.94				1,035.94
Michael Gallagher:									
Turkey	Lira		335.21						335.21
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		1,301.00						1,301.00
Qatar	Riyal		451.90						451.90
United States	Dollar				4,262.00				4,262.00
Dana Stroul:									
Turkey	Lira		249.00						249.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		1,025.25						1,025.25
Qatar	Riyal		829.66						829.66
United States	Dollar				3,969.40				3,969.40
Delegation Expenses: *									
Turkey	Lira						113.37		113.37
Saudi Arabia	Riyal						1,134.68		1,134.68
Qatar	Riyal						102.97		102.97
Jodi Herman:									
Austria	Euro		683.65						683.65
France	Euro		489.78						489.78
United States	Dollar				2,267.70				2,267.70
Lowell Schwartz:									
Austria	Euro		671.26						671.26
France	Euro		617.65						617.65
United States	Dollar				2,232.70				2,232.70
Delegation Expenses: *									
Austria	Euro						845.06		845.06
France	Euro						990.00		990.00
Chris Homan:									
Indonesia	Rupiah		412.27						412.27
Vietnam	Dong		294.60						294.60
South Korea	Won		308.18						308.18
United States	Dollar				8,118.41				8,118.41
Delegation Expenses: *									
Vietnam	Dong						14.40		14.40
South Korea	Won						616.99		616.99
Damian Murphy:									
Bangladesh	Taka		695.00						695.00
Nepal	Rupee		813.59						813.59
United States	Dollar				5,439.17				5,439.17
Charlotte Oldham-Moore:									
Bangladesh	Taka		695.00						695.00
Nepal	Rupee		813.59						813.59
United States	Dollar				5,439.17				5,439.17
Stacie Oliver:									
Turkey	Lira		316.21						316.21
Kuwait	Dinar		350.24						350.24
Jordan	Dinar		445.25						445.25
Egypt	Pound		725.31						725.31
Germany	Euro		341.66						341.66
United States	Dollar				3,528.70				3,528.70
Delegation Expenses: *									
Kuwait	Dinar						205.86		205.86
Jordan	Dinar						190.22		190.22
Egypt	Pound						164.00		164.00
Germany	Euro						11.32		11.32
Chris Socha:									
Poland	Zloty		600.00						600.00
United States	Dollar				3,596.70				3,596.70
Daniel Vajdich:									
Montenegro	Euro		285.00						285.00
Moldova	Leu		1,014.00						1,014.00
United States	Dollar				3,956.00				3,956.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Montenegro	Euro						144.00		144.00
Moldova	Leu						138.70		138.70
Brandon Yoder:									
Honduras	Lempira		714.00						714.00
United States	Dollar				1,059.20				1,059.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Honduras	Lempira						394.00		394.00
Totals:			34,966.03		134,510.57		15,568.62		185,045.22

* Delegation expenses included payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Jan. 28, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Robert Casey:									
Norway	Kroner		163.96						163.96
Caitlin Gearen:									
Norway	Kroner		306.74						306.74
Delegation Expenses: *									
Norway	Kroner						713.26		713.26
Total			470.70				713.26		1,183.96

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions,
Jan. 26, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jim Catella:									
India	Dollar		670.00						670.00
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
Pakistan	Dollar		180.00						180.00
Doha	Dollar		164.00						164.00
Senator Marco Rubio:									
Colombia	Dollar		155.00		4,139.70				4,294.70
Brian Walsh:									
Colombia	Dollar		155.00		4,139.70				4,294.70
Total			1,380.00		8,279.40				9,659.40

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Dec. 23, 2014.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Killion:									
Germany	Euro		1,307.55						1,307.55
United States	Dollar				12,130.50				12,130.50
Switzerland	Franc		2,663.44						2,663.44
United States	Dollar				11,905.70				11,905.70
Erika Schlager:									
Poland	Zloty		3,216.00						3,216.00
Austria	Euro		417.00						417.00
United States	Dollar				4,794.50				4,794.50
Switzerland	Franc		2,663.44						2,663.44
United States	Dollar				2,000.30				2,000.30
Mischa Thompson:									
Germany	Euro		1,985.00						1,985.00
United States	Dollar				1,797.60				1,797.60
Alex Johnson:									
Poland	Zloty		3,637.04						3,637.04
United States	Dollar				759.37				759.37
Germany	Euro		1,286.63						1,286.63
United States	Dollar				960.50				960.50
Switzerland	Franc		2,219.53						2,219.53
United States	Dollar				1,156.10				1,156.10
Austria	Euro		23,300.78						23,300.78
United States	Dollar				1,074.90				1,074.90
Robert Hand:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,632.72						1,632.72
Boznia and Herzegov	Mark		1,372.00						1,372.00
United States	Dollar				3,359.70				3,359.70
Orest Deychakiwsky:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,765.00						1,765.00
United States	Dollar				1,692.40				1,692.40
Allison Hollabaugh:									
Austria	Euro		807.50						807.50
United States	Dollar				1,750.50				1,750.50
Shelly Han:									
Moldova	Leu		1,156.00						1,156.00
Germany	Euro		298.58						298.58
United States	Dollar				4,331.20				4,331.20
David Kostelancik:									
Switzerland	Franc		1,951.44						1,951.44
United States	Dollar				4,714.30				4,714.30
Janice Helwig:									
Switzerland	Franc		2,489.44						2,489.44
United States	Dollar				12,654.30				12,654.30
Poland	Zloty		3,492.08						3,492.08
United States	Dollar				3,048.50				3,048.50
Total			57,661.17		68,130.37				125,791.54

SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Jan. 14, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), THE REPUBLICAN LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 30, 2014

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Hawkins:									
Turkey	Dollar		284.00				32.75		316.75
Saudi Arabia	Dollar		505.00				233.00		738.00
Kuwait	Dollar		386.28				125.00		511.28
Total			1,175.28				390.75		1,566.03

SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
The Republican Leader, Jan. 30, 2015.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the resolution of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address take place on Monday, February 23, following the prayer and pledge; further, that Senator HOEVEN be recognized to deliver the address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, February 10; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the first hour be equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half. I further ask that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow the for weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Reserving the right to object, may I have one sentence to observe that there appears as yet to be no Republican plan whatsoever to answer the energy chairman's question on climate change—what do we do—and with that noted, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would just say to my friend from Rhode Island that the Senator knows we just finished a lengthy floor consideration of the Keystone bill, with an open amendment process on this and other energy-related topics. The Senate voted on several amendments on climate change, including two from the Senator from

Rhode Island, which is more opportunities to vote on these amendments than during the entire 113th Congress.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, may I say how much I appreciate the open amendment process.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, as modified by the order of February 9, 2015, appoints the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. HOEVEN, to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 23, 2015.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

PRIORITY REGISTRATION FOR VETERANS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, this week we celebrate Salute to Veterans Week to honor all those who have served our Nation in uniform and their families who sacrificed so much for our country.

This week is a particularly appropriate time for us to reflect on the importance of fulfilling our commitment to all veterans. Just as we invest in and train our men and women during their military service, we must make the same investments when they return to our communities, hang up their uniforms, and embark on the next phase of their lives. This institution always seems to be willing to vote for

money so we can send people to war, but is a bit less generous in taking care of those veterans when they return home. That should stop.

This morning I visited Eastern Gateway Community College in Youngstown and met with local veterans, including community college graduate Lisa Thomas. She graduated last May and is now pursuing a 4-year degree—after getting a 2-year degree—at Franklin University using her GI benefits.

Community colleges like Eastern Gateway are an important way we provide our veterans with the necessary skills to find decent-paying jobs. They serve as pipelines for veterans so they can attend 4-year universities.

The GI bill's education benefits are critical to investing in returning servicemembers. They help the veterans who have returned from war to learn new skills, and as a result these men and women have helped to build our middle class and led to our Nation's dominance in the second half of the 20th century and into this century. But veterans, as some find out unwittingly, have a limited amount of time before their GI benefits expire.

At crowded colleges, general education requirements and prerequisites often fill up quickly, and it can take several semesters for that veteran to secure a spot. Waiting for a spot in a required course is a luxury many veterans don't have because those veterans benefits could expire. If student veterans are unable to finish their degrees before these benefits expire, they may end up being forced to pay thousands of dollars in out-of-pocket tuition and fees. The veterans who served our Nation without delay should not face delays in getting their education.

Many colleges and universities—Youngstown State, which is the same place where the Eastern Gateway campus in Youngstown is located, is where many Eastern Gateway students complete their degrees. They offer veterans priority registration so they can get the courses they need before their benefits run out.

All of our colleges and universities—2-year, 4-year, public and private—need to follow Youngstown State's lead. If student athletes have priority registration, we can surely extend that privilege to those who have served our Nation. That is why in the coming

months I will introduce legislation to ensure that all veterans, all service-members, and their qualifying dependents can use their GI benefits to their full potential and be guaranteed priority registration. Our veterans have earned these benefits, and we must ensure that all of our veterans, such as Lisa Thomas, are able to take full advantage of those benefits for themselves and for their families. It is our duty to ensure that when veterans return home, they have the education and training and access to jobs they need to fulfill their potential. We have a duty to ensure that those returning from service to our Nation get the care they need when they come home.

As the first Ohioan to serve a full term on the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have worked to ease the VA backlog and put in place a better system. The shortage of care providers has been especially pressing for veterans struggling with a brain injury—the so-called invisible injuries.

When our country went into Iraq a dozen years ago, our leader said that

this will be a short war. Our country, our government, our administration, and our Congress failed to scale up veterans hospitals and veterans care and increase the capacity, and we now find it is too small. That is the importance of making sure we do this right.

Nearly 300,000 veterans in this country struggle with post-traumatic distress. Out of an estimated 300,000 traumatic brain injuries, there are 25,000 cases of mild traumatic brain injuries. These cases are hard to diagnose and document since there is often a lack of visible evidence.

Without proper care, each year some 8,000 veterans take their own lives—154 a week, 22 veterans a day commit suicide. What a tragedy. Last week I was proud to stand with my colleagues in this body in support of the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act. I look forward to President Obama signing that bill later this week. It is our duty to take an active role in increasing veterans' access to quality mental health care, and the Clay Hunt Act will help ensure that

those who put their lives on the line for us have a lifetime of their own upon returning home. We have a sacred trust between our government and those who protect us all.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:20 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, February 10, 2015, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 9, 2015:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL P. BOTTICELLI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY.